arXiv:1611.09329v1 [math.AP] 28 Nov 2016

Accelerated front propagation for monostable equations with nonlocal diffusion

Dmitri Finkelshtein[1] Yuri Kondratiev[2] Pasha Tkachov[3]

November 29, 2016

Abstract

We describe acceleration of the front propagation for solutions to a class of monostable nonlinear equations with a nonlocal diffusion in $\mathbb{R}^d$. We show that the acceleration takes place if either the diffusion kernel or the initial condition has 'regular' heavy tails in $\mathbb{R}^d$ (in particular, decays slower than exponentially). Under general assumptions which can be verified for particular models, we present sharp estimates for the time-space zone which separates the region of convergence to the unstable zero solution with the region of convergence to the stable positive constant solution. We consider differences between the case when the initial condition decays in all directions at infinity with the case of the initial condition decreasing along all coordinate axes. We obtain new estimates for solutions to a linear nonlocal equation as well.

Keywords: nonlocal diffusion, reaction-diffusion equation, front propagation, acceleration, monostable equation, nonlocal nonlinearity, long-time behavior, integral equation

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 35B40, 35K57, 47G20, 45G10

1 Introduction

1.1 Main assumptions

We will deal with the equation

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial}{\partial t}u(x,t) = \varkappa(a*u)(x,t) - mu(x,t) - u(x,t)(Gu)(x,t), \\ u(x,0) = u_0(x). \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

Here $u : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}$, where $\mathbb{R}_+ := [0,\infty)$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$; $\varkappa > 0$; $m \in \mathbb{R}$; $u_0 : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ is an initial condition; the function $a \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d) := L^1(\mathbb{R}^d, dx)$ is a probability

[1]Department of Mathematics, Swansea University, Singleton Park, Swansea SA2 8PP, U.K. (d.l.finkelshtein@swansea.ac.uk).

[2]Fakultät für Mathematik, Universität Bielefeld, Postfach 110 131, 33501 Bielefeld, Germany (kondrat@math.uni-bielefeld.de).

[3]Fakultät für Mathematik, Universität Bielefeld, Postfach 110 131, 33501 Bielefeld, Germany (ptkachov@math.uni-bielefeld.de).

kernel, i.e. $a(x) \geq 0$ for a.a. (almost all) $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} a(x)\,dx = 1; \tag{1.2}$$

the symbol $*$ stands for the convolution in x on $\mathbb{R}^d$, i.e.

$$(a * u)(x,t) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} a(x-y)u(y,t)\,dx;$$

and, finally, G is a mapping on functions which is acting in x, i.e. $(Gu)(x,t) := \big(Gu(\cdot,t)\big)(x)$.

The function $u(x,t)$ may be interpreted as the local density of an evolving in time system of entities which reproduce themselves, compete, and die. The reproduction may appear according to dispersion, which is realized via the fecundity rate $\varkappa$ and the density a of a probability dispersion distribution. The death may appear with the density dependent rate Gu, which describes a competition within the system (the conditions below will ensure that $Gu \geq 0$ under appropriate bounds on u). Next, $m = m^- - m^+ \in \mathbb{R}$, where $m^- \geq 0$ is the constant rate of inner mortality within the system, and $m^+ \geq 0$ is the division (branching) rate. The latter can be considered as a zero-range dispersion, i.e. $m^+u(x,t) = m^+ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u(y,t)\delta(x-y)dy$ (where δ is the Dirac delta-function at the origin). An underlying individual-based model, for the case $m = m^- > 0$, $m^+ = 0$ and G given by (1.9) below, can be found in [7, 20], cf. also [22, 27, 31] regarding the derivation of the equation.

We will consider (1.1) in a space E of (essentially) bounded on $\mathbb{R}^d$ functions, i.e. $u(\cdot,t) \in E$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $G : E \to E$. In the following, E is either the space $C_{ub}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ of bounded uniformly continuous functions on $\mathbb{R}^d$ with sup-norm or the space $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) := L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, dx)$ of essentially bounded, w.r.t. (with respect to) the Lebesgue measure dx, functions on $\mathbb{R}^d$ with ess sup-norm.

By a solution to (1.1) on $\mathbb{R}_+$, we will understand the so-called classical solution, that is a mapping $u : \mathbb{R}_+ \to E$ which is continuous in $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and continuously differentiable (in the sense of the norm in E) in $t \in (0, \infty)$.

Being interested in a spreading in space system, we will assume that

$$\beta := \varkappa - m > 0. \tag{A1}$$

Clearly, for $m \leq 0$, this condition is redundant.

Next, interpreting Gu as a density dependent rate one has to have its non-negativity. Therefore, we assume that

$$\begin{gathered} \text{there exists } \theta > 0 \text{ such that} \\ Gv \geq 0 \quad \text{for } 0 \leq v \leq \theta. \end{gathered} \tag{A2}$$

Here and below all inequalities, in the case of $E = L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, are considered almost everywhere only.

Obviously, $u = 0$ solves the equation in (1.1). We are going to have the θ above as another constant in space and time solution to (1.1). More precisely, we assume that

$$\begin{gathered} G \text{ is continuous at } 0 \in E \text{ on the set } \{v \in E : v \geq 0\}, \\ G0 = 0, \text{ and } Gv \leq G\theta = \beta \text{ for } 0 \leq v \leq \theta. \end{gathered} \tag{A3}$$

Under assumptions (A1)–(A3), one can rewrite (1.1) in the reaction-diffusion form

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial}{\partial t}u(x,t) = \varkappa(a*u)(x,t) - \varkappa u(x,t) + (Fu)(x,t), \\ u(x,0) = u_0(x), \end{cases} \tag{1.3}$$

where

$$Fv := v(\beta - Gv), \quad v \in E, \tag{1.4}$$

and we will have then

$$F\theta = F0 = 0 \le Fv \le \beta v, \quad 0 \le v \le \theta. \tag{1.5}$$

In the recent decade, there is a growing interest to the study of nonlocal reaction-diffusion equations of the form (1.3) see e.g. [1, 6, 8, 15–19, 33, 38, 42, 49, 54, 58, 59] for the monostable case (1.5); for the origins of the topic see e.g. [4, 21, 51, 52, 57].

The linear operator

$$Lu = \varkappa a * u - \varkappa u \tag{1.6}$$

in (1.3) is the generator of a nonlocal diffusion in $\mathbb{R}^d$, also known as the random walk in continuous time. The properties of solutions to the corresponding nonlocal evolution equation have been also actively studied recently, see e.g. [3,10,40] and the references therein.

The solution u to the equation (1.3) may be interpreted as a density of a species which invades according to a nonlocal diffusion within the space $\mathbb{R}^d$ meeting a reaction F, see e.g. [26,47,53].

Note that the most of the references above are related to the 'local' reaction F in (1.3), i.e. $(Fu)(x) = f(u(x))$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, for some $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$. Two classical examples for an appropriate f are $f(s) = \nu s(\theta - s)$, cf. [29], and $f(s) = \nu s(\theta - s)^2$, cf. [39]; for some $\nu > 0$.

Conversely, one can start from the nonlocal reaction-diffusion equation (1.3), where $\varkappa$ and a are as the above, and there exists $\theta > 0$, such that F fulfills (1.5). More precisely, we assume that $\dfrac{Fv}{v} \in E$ if only $v \in E$, and

$$\beta = \inf\{\gamma : Fv \le \gamma v,\ 0 \le v \le \theta\} > 0.$$

Then one can rewrite (1.3) in the form (1.1) with $m := \varkappa - \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $Gv := \beta - \dfrac{Fv}{v}$. Then (A1)–(A3) hold, provided that

$$\beta - \frac{Fv}{v} \to 0, \quad v \to 0, \tag{1.7}$$

where both convergences are in the sense of the norm in E. Since $F0 = 0$, the convergence (1.7) with necessity implies that $F'(0)v = \beta v$, where $F'(0)$ is the Fréchet derivative taken over $\{v \ge 0\}$.

In the case of the local $Fv = f(v)$ with $f(0) = 0$, (1.7) is just equivalent to $f'(0) = \beta$. Note that the importance of the assumption

$$f(u) \le f'(0)u, \quad 0 \le u \le \theta \tag{1.8}$$

for the front propagation described below was pointed out in e.g. [8, 18]; this condition can be weaken though, see [56]. Moreover, the condition (1.8) leads to the possibility to describe the front using the linearized version of the corresponding equations (1.1) and (1.3) about 0, that is just (1.19) below. We are going to show a similar result for a general F which fulfills (1.5). Note also that, for the classical Fisher–KPP-type equation, where (1.6) in (1.1) is replaced by the Laplace operator in $\mathbb{R}^d$, the condition (1.8) was used in e.g. [32, 57]. The condition $f'(0) > 0$ is also standard in the literature; the opposite degenerate case $f'(0) = 0$ leads to specific effects, see e.g. [2, 60].

Stress that, however, the inequality $Fv \le \beta v$ in (1.5) is quite restrictive for a general 'nonlocal' operator F. Even the linear operator $Fv = \mu\, b * v$, for some $\mu > 0$ and a probability kernel b, does not satisfy this assumption (in particular, for a strictly positive b and a compactly supported v). As a result, the 'fully nonlocal' analogue of the Fisher-type reaction $Fu = \mu\, u(\theta - u)$, given by $Fu = \mu\, (b * u)(\theta - b * u)$, lies out of our consideration. Instead, our model example for (1.1) will be

$$Gu = \varkappa^- a^- * u, \tag{1.9}$$

where $\varkappa^- > 0$ and a^- is also a probability kernel on $\mathbb{R}^d$; that leads to

$$Fu = u(\beta - \varkappa^- a^- * u) = \varkappa^- u(\theta - a^- * u), \tag{1.10}$$

$$\theta = \frac{\beta}{\varkappa^-} = \frac{\varkappa - m}{\varkappa^-}. \tag{1.11}$$

Evidently, the assumptions (A1)–(A3) hold for G given by (1.9). The corresponding equation (1.1) with $m \in (0, \varkappa)$ (i.e. $\beta \in (0, \varkappa)$) was considered in [27, 28, 31, 49, 58]; for the case $m = 0$, see [45, 46].

The rest of assumptions one needs are related to the properties of the solutions to (1.1). Denote

$$(\mathcal{F}u)(x,t) := \frac{\partial}{\partial t} u(x,t) - \varkappa (a * u)(x,t) + m u(x,t) + u(x,t)(Gu)(x,t). \tag{1.12}$$

Comparison principle. Assume that the conditions

$$\begin{gathered} (\mathcal{F}u_1)(x,t) \le (\mathcal{F}u_2)(x,t), \\ u_1(x,t) \ge 0, \quad 0 \le u_2(x,t) \le \theta, \quad u_1(x,0) \le u_2(x,0) \\ \text{imply that } \ u_1(x,t) \le u_2(x,t),\ t > 0. \end{gathered} \tag{A4}$$

Existence and uniqueness. Assume that

$$\begin{gathered} \text{for any } 0 \le u_0 \le \theta, \text{ there exists a unique} \\ \text{classical solution } u \text{ to (1.1) on } \mathbb{R}_+ \end{gathered} \tag{A5}$$

Moreover, since $u = 0$ and $u = \theta$ are constant solutions to (1.1), we immediately get from (A4)–(A5), that

$$0 \le u(\cdot, t) \le \theta, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}_+. \tag{1.13}$$

(Weak) 'hair-trigger' effect, cf. [5, Theorem 3.1]. Assume that

$$\begin{gathered}\text{if, for some } \delta>0,\ \mu_0\in(0,\theta),\ x_0\in\mathbb{R}^d,\\ \text{and for, centered at } x_0, \text{ the unit ball } B_1(x_0)\\ \text{with respect to an arbitrary norm on } \mathbb{R}^d,\\ 0\le u_0\le\theta \text{ and } u_0(x)\ge\mu_0 \text{ for a.a. } x\in B_1(x_0),\\ \text{then, for any } \mu\in(0,\theta), \text{ there exists } t_\mu>0,\\ \text{such that } u(x,t)\ge\mu \text{ for a.a. } x\in B_1(x_0) \text{ and for all } t\ge t_\mu.\end{gathered}\tag{A6}$$

Note that (A4) and (A6) imply that $u=0$ and $u=\theta$ are the unique non-negative constant solutions to the equation (1.1) in $\{0\le u\le\theta\}$.

The crucial assumption in (A6) is that t_μ does not depend on $x_0\in\mathbb{R}^d$. The 'strong' form of the hair-trigger effect usually includes that the solution uniformly reaches any level less than θ on an arbitrary ball, not necessary also centered at x_0 (the time t_μ will depend on its radius though).

For the local operator $Fu=f(u)$, assumptions on f and u_0 which imply (A4) and (A5) may be found in e.g. [4, 16, 52, 59]. In particular, one needs that $f(0)=f(\theta)=0$, $f'(0)>0$, $f(s)>0$ for $s\in(0,\theta)$, and (1.8) holds. The hair-trigger effect, for the case $d=1$, was shown in [33].

For the equation (1.1) with G given by (1.9) and $m\in(0,\varkappa)$, we have shown in [28, Theorem 2.2], that (A5) holds even regardless of an upper bound for u_0; moreover, the solution is unique on each finite time interval $t\in[0,T]$, $T>0$. Note also, that it is straightforward to check that the proof there remains unchanged for an arbitrary G in (1.4) which is globally Lipschitz on E, and $m\in(0,\varkappa)$.

Next, the comparison principle (A4), for G given by (1.9) and $m\in(0,\varkappa)$, was proved in [28, Theorem 3.1], under the additional assumption that

$$J(x):=\varkappa a(x)-(\varkappa-m)a^-(x)\ge 0,\quad \text{for a.a. } x\in\mathbb{R}^d.\tag{1.14}$$

Finally, the condition (A6) for such G and m is checked in Proposition 4.1 below; as a matter of fact, we prove there, using the results of [28] (which were based on [55]), even the 'strong' hair-trigger effect described above.

1.2 Problem description

The present paper is aimed to study the propagation of the front for a solution to the equation (1.1). To describe this notion, one needs two families $\{\mathscr{O}_t\}$ and $\{\mathscr{C}_t\}$ of subsets in $\mathbb{R}^d$, such that $\mathscr{O}_t$, being unbounded, vanishes as $t\to\infty$, i.e. $\mathscr{O}_t\searrow\emptyset$, whereas $\mathscr{C}_t$, being non-necessary bounded, expands to $\mathbb{R}^d$, i.e. $\mathscr{C}_t\nearrow\mathbb{R}^d$, $t\to\infty$.

By the front, we understand a set $\Gamma_t=\mathbb{R}^d\setminus(\mathscr{O}_t\cup\mathscr{C}_t)$, such that, for any $x_t\in\mathscr{C}_t$, the values of $u(x_t,t)$ will converge (as $t\to\infty$) to θ, whereas, for any $y_t\in\mathscr{O}_t$, the values of $u(y_t,t)$ will converge to 0. Moreover, we will show that (under appropriate assumptions) these convergences hold uniformly in x; more precisely, we are going to prove that, under some assumptions on a and u_0,

$$\operatorname*{ess\,inf}_{x\in\mathscr{C}_t}u(x,t)\to\theta,\quad t\to\infty,\tag{1.15}$$

$$\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{x\in\mathscr{O}_t}u(x,t)\le Ce^{-ct},\quad t>\tau,\tag{1.16}$$

for some $\tau, C, c > 0$, which depend on u_0, a, and the family $\{\mathscr{O}_t\}$.

Naturally, we are interested to have the set Γ_t, in some sense, the 'narrowest' possible. A natural way would be to show the existence of a family $\{\Lambda_t\}$, $\Lambda_t \nearrow \mathbb{R}^d$, such that

$$\mathscr{C}_t = \Lambda_{(1-\varepsilon)t}, \qquad \mathscr{O}_t = \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Lambda_{(1+\varepsilon)t} \tag{1.17}$$

for an arbitrary small enough $\varepsilon > 0$. Note that Γ_t, in general, will also expand as $t \to \infty$ (moreover, in the accelerated case described below it will be even with necessity, see [35]).

The (un)boundedness of the sets Λ_t depends on the initial condition u_0. Namely, if $\lim\limits_{|x|\to\infty} u_0(x) = 0$, then Λ_t is a bounded set. In particular, if, additionally, a and u_0 are radially symmetric, then Λ_t will be just a ball with a radius $\eta(t) = \eta(t, \varkappa, a, u_0) \to \infty$, $t \to \infty$. However, if for example, $\lim\limits_{\rho\to\infty} u_0((\rho, \dots, \rho)) = 0$ and $\lim\limits_{\rho\to-\infty} u_0((\rho, \dots, \rho)) \in (0, \theta]$, then Λ_t is unbounded (cf. Figure 1 below).

The propagation of the front, described by (1.15)–(1.17), is said to have a constant speed (or just is linear in time), if, roughly speaking, $\Lambda_t = t\Lambda_1$, for a fixed $\Lambda_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ dependent on the parameters of the equation (1.1). (Here $tA = \{tx : x \in A\}$ for an $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$.)

Mollison [45, 46] was, probably, the first one who pointed out that to have a propagation with a constant speed both the kernel a and the initial condition u_0 have to decay quick enough at infinity. Namely, he has considered the case $d = 1$, F given by (1.4) with G of the form (1.9), where $\varkappa^- = \varkappa$, $a^- = a$, $\beta = \varkappa$, and u_0 is a decreasing on the whole $\mathbb{R}$ initial condition. He has shown that the property of the corresponding propagation front to have some averaged constant speed is deeply related with the existence of a $\lambda > 0$, such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} a(s)e^{\lambda s}ds < \infty, \qquad \sup_{s\in\mathbb{R}} u_0(s)e^{\lambda s} < \infty.$$

Note that such u_0 gave an unbounded set $\Lambda_t = (-\infty, \tilde{c}t)$, where $\tilde{c}$ is related to a speed of the propagation.

In [28, Theorems 5.9, 5.10, Corollary 5.11], we have considered, for a general $d \in \mathbb{N}$, the equation (1.1) with $m \in (0, \varkappa)$ and G given by (1.9) under the assumption (1.14) (and, additionally, we assumed that the function J, defined by (1.14), is separated from zero in a neighborhood of the origin). There was proved that the corresponding front of the propagation has a constant speed, provided that $a \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} a(x)e^{\mu|x|}dx < \infty, \quad \text{for some } \mu > 0, \\ &\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d} u_0(x)e^{\lambda|x|} < \infty, \quad \text{for any } \lambda > 0. \end{aligned} \tag{1.18}$$

In particular, here Λ_1 appeared a bounded convex set.

Note that, under assumptions (A1), (A2) and (A5), we have that, for any $0 \le u_0 \le \theta$, the corresponding solution u to (1.1) is majorised by the solution to the following linear problem

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial}{\partial t}w(x,t) = \varkappa(a * w)(x,t) - mw(x,t), \\ w(x,0) = u_0(x), \end{cases} \tag{1.19}$$

i.e., for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d,\ t \in \mathbb{R}_+$,

$$u(x,t) \le w(x,t) = e^{-mt}\big(e^{\varkappa tA} u_0\big)(x), \tag{1.20}$$

where $Au := a * u$, $u \in E$ is a bounded operator on E. It is crucial that, see Section 7 below, the technique of [28] proves, as a matter of fact, the inequality (1.16) for the solution w to (1.1) as well. As a result, because of (1.20), one gets that, for any G which satisfies (A2), the conditions (1.18) imply (1.16) for the solution to (1.1), with $\mathscr{O}_t = \Lambda_{(1+\varepsilon)t} = (1+\varepsilon)t\Lambda_1$. In other words, the propagation is at most linear in time.

The conditions (1.18) are closed to the necessary ones, cf. [33, 59]. We have proved in [28, Theorem 5.21] that if a bit weaker form of (1.18) fails for a (roughly, if $a$is 'heavier' than any exponent at infinity), then (1.15) holds with $\mathscr{C}_t = tK$ for an *arbitrary* compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. Therefore, the propagation of the front is faster than linear. This effect of an infinite speed of propagation, see [33, 35, 59], is called sometimes in literature an acceleration of the propagation, having in mind, for example, that the mentioned above radius $\eta(t)$ of the ball Λ_t (in the case when $\lim\limits_{|x|\to\infty} u_0(x) = 0$) is such that $\dfrac{\eta(t)}{t} \to \infty$, $t \to \infty$.

The acceleration for the case $d = 1$ and the mentioned above local operator $Fu = f(u)$ was known in mathematical biology, see e.g. the results and references in [34, 41, 43]. The first rigorous result in this direction was done by Garnier [33], who proved (1.15) and the convergence to 0 for the ess sup in (1.16) for $d = 1$ and a compactly supported initial condition u_0. However, in his approach, the sets $\mathscr{O}_t$ and $\mathscr{C}_t$ had not appeared connected by something like (1.17), i.e. the result was not sharp. Note that the technique in [33] was inspired by [36], where an acceleration was shown for the mentioned above classical KPP-equation with a slowly decaying initial condition; see also the recent paper [37]. Analogical results were obtained in [11] for the equation of the type (1.3), where Lu, cf. (1.6), was replaced to a fractional Laplacian (in particular, the kernel a was singular and non-integrable); cf. also [25, 44].

We will describe below sufficient conditions on a and u_0 (when, in particular, one of assumptions (1.18) fails) to get (1.16) under general assumptions (A1), (A2), and (A5) only. Evidently, in contrast to the case of a constant speed, the existing of an acceleration can be obtained from an appropriate description of $\mathscr{C}_t$ in (1.15) only. To get this, we should assume the rest of the conditions above.

1.3 Overview of results

We start with an informal explanation of the background for our method. Consider the simplest case $d = 1$, $a(x) = b(|x|)$ and $u_0(x) = q(|x|)$, where both $b, q : \mathbb{R} \to (0,\infty)$ are even and decreasing on the whole $\mathbb{R}_+$ functions, $\int_{\mathbb{R}} b(s)\,ds = 1$. Let, in contrast to (1.18),

$$\lim_{s\to\infty} e^{\lambda s} b(s) = \infty \quad \text{for all } \lambda > 0.$$

Among all functions with this property, there are functions with 'regular' tails called sub-exponential functions, see e.g. [23, 30] and also examples in Subsection 2.3 below. A sub-exponential function b with $\int_{\mathbb{R}} b(s)\,ds = 1$ has the

following key property:

$$\big(\underbrace{b*\ldots*b}_{n}\big)(s)\sim nb(s),\quad s\to\infty. \tag{1.21}$$

Suppose also, for simplicity, that $q(s)=o(b(s))$, $s\to\infty$. Then, informally speaking, one might expect to have in (1.20), for any $t>0$,

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-mt}e^{\varkappa tA}u_0 &\sim e^{-mt}u_0+e^{-mt}\left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{(\varkappa t)^n}{n!}nb\right)*u_0\\ &= e^{-mt}u_0+e^{-mt}e^{\varkappa t}\varkappa t(b*q)\sim e^{\beta t}\varkappa t\, b, \end{aligned} \tag{1.22}$$

since (1.21) and $q=o(b)$ imply $b*q\sim b$ (the latter can be shown similarly to [30, Lemma 4.9]). Of course, these considerations are far from rigorous ones, in particular, because of that the both sides in (1.21) become close for $s\geq s_n$, where $s_n\to\infty$. However, the equivalence (1.22) allows us to guess that a level set for the solution $u(x,t)$ to (1.1) with the initial condition u_0 might be described by a function $\mu(t)b(|x|)$. The further rigorous analysis shows that $e^{\beta(1-\varepsilon)t}\leq\mu(t)\leq e^{\beta(1+\varepsilon)t}$ for an arbitrary small enough $\varepsilon>0$.

Namely, for $x\in\mathbb{R}$, such that $e^{\beta(1+\varepsilon)t}b(|x|)\leq 1$ (that is the set $\mathbb{R}^d\setminus\Lambda_{(1+\varepsilon)t}$ in (1.17)), we will get that $u(x,t)\leq c_1e^{-c_2\varepsilon t}$ for some $c_1,c_2>0$; whereas, for $x\in\mathbb{R}$, where $e^{\beta(1-\varepsilon)t}b(|x|)\geq 1$ (that is the set $\Lambda_{(1-\varepsilon)t}$ in (1.17)), the solution $u(x,t)$ will be bigger than any a priori chosen level $\mu\in(0,\theta)$, provided that $\varepsilon>0$ is small enough and $t>0$ is big enough.

Similar arguments may be considered for the case of monotone u_0, namely, when $u_0(x)=\int_x^\infty q(|y|)\,dy$. The difference is that then $(a*u_0)(x)\sim\int_x^\infty a(y)\,dy$, and the level set will be described by the latter function.

If, on the contrary, $b=o(q)$ and $q*q\sim 2q$ (that is enough for q to be sub-exponential) then $\underbrace{b*\ldots*b}_{n}*q\sim q=u_0$, and similar arguments show that the level set will be described by u_0; the latter holds for a monotone u_0 as well.

Sketches of solutions for two cases of initial conditions u_0 are shown on Figure 1.



(a) The case of $u_0(\pm\infty)=0$

(b) The case of monotone u_0 with $u_0(-\infty)\in(0,\theta]$, $u_0(\infty)=0$

Figure 1: Sketch of the solution for $d=1$ describing (1.15) and (1.16). Here $\mathscr{C}_t=\Lambda_{(1-\varepsilon)t}$, $\quad\mathscr{O}_t=\mathbb{R}\setminus\Lambda_{(1+\varepsilon)t}=:\Lambda^c_{(1+\varepsilon)t}$

These, beside non-rigorous, arguments do not work at all for the case $d>1$. To explain the reasons, note that the property (1.21) is inherited from the sub-exponential property of the distribution function $\mathbb{F}$ of a random variable, whose

density is given by b. Then (1.21) is replaced by

$$1 - \mathbb{F} * \mathbb{F} \sim 2(1 - \mathbb{F}), \tag{1.23}$$

see e.g. [9,12,13,24,30]. Since the convolution of the distribution functions corresponds to the distribution function for the sum of the corresponding random variables, (1.23) may be interpreted as that the sum of two long random jumps behaves as doubled one random jump. The latter idea together with (1.23) can be successfully extended to the multidimensional case, see [14,48,50]. However, this extension is not directly related to an analogue of (1.21) for $n = 2$, because of the obvious

$$1 - \int_{-\infty}^{x_1} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{x_d} a(y)\, dy \neq \int_{x_1}^{\infty} \dots \int_{x_d}^{\infty} a(y)\, dy, \quad d \geq 2.$$

Instead, to deal with $d > 1$, we consider, first, the case $a(x) = b(|x|)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, where b is a sub-exponential as the above (up to a normalizing factor, plus several technical assumptions which are fulfilled in examples). Then, again informally, one can get that, for some $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$,

$$u(x, t) \leq e^{\beta(1+\varepsilon)t} a^{\alpha}(x),$$

for big enough t and $|x|$, and for *any* $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ which is 'close' to 1. As a result, one can estimate the front using the level sets constructed by a^{α} and, finally, because the α is arbitrary close to 1, describe the front by a itself. Again, this is true if $u_0(x) = q(|x|)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and q decays no faster then b. Otherwise the front will be described by u_0.

Similar arguments (but a bit more technical) may be applied for the case of a 'monotone' initial condition of the form $u_0(x) = \int_{\Delta(x)} q(|y|)\, dy$, where $\Delta(x) = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^d : y_j \geq x_j,\ 1 \leq j \leq d\}$ (and a is as the above). In this case, the front will be described by either $\int_{\Delta(x)} a(y)\, dy$ or by u_0 itself, whichever is 'thicker' at infinity. The rigorous statement for these particular radially symmetric cases is given in Corollary 6.9 below.

To have a flexibility in the choice of a and u_0, we allow to have double side estimates, namely, for a.a. $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$b_+(|x|) \leq a(x) \leq b^+(|x|), \qquad q_\circ(x) \leq p(x) \leq q^\circ(|x|), \tag{1.24}$$

and $u_0(x) = p(x)$ or $u_0(x) = \int_{\Delta(x)} p(y)\, dy$, provided that, asymptotically,

$$\log b_+ \sim \log b^+ \sim \log b, \qquad \log q_\circ \sim \log q^\circ \sim \log q. \tag{1.25}$$

Then under conditions and relations for b and q as the above, the results remain unchanged. Note that the examples in Subsection 2.3 and Section 6 show that the assumptions (1.25) are close to necessary ones, to have a sharp description of front, given by (1.17).

The paper is organised as follows. In Section 2, we describe the needed classes of heavy tailed functions on real line and prove basic results about them. We allow wide range of decaying rates for this functions: starting from 'almost exponential' function $b(s) = \exp\big(-\frac{s}{(\log s)^{\alpha}}\big)$, $\alpha > 1$ and till the so-called fat-tailed function $b(s) = s^{-\alpha}$, $\alpha > d$, see the examples in Subsection 2.3. We study

also the corresponding level sets on $\mathbb{R}$ and prove why, for the logarithmically equivalent functions, cf. (1.25), the level sets above are 'interchangeable' for different small values of ε, see Proposition 2.31. In Section 3, we extend, in an appropriate sense, some of these results to the case of a general $d \in \mathbb{N}$.

Section 4 is devoted to the proof of (1.15). First, we prove that G given by (1.9) satisfies the assumption (A6), see Proposition 4.1, provided that the additional condition (4.2) holds. Next, using, in particular, the assumption (A3), we prove that the function $\lambda \min\{1, e^{\beta(1-\varepsilon)t} c(x)\}$ is a sub-solution to (1.1) for a small enough $\lambda > 0$, see Proposition 4.8. In the notations above, $c(x)$ will be chosen among the functions $b(|x|)$, $\int_{\Delta(x)} b(|y|)\, dy$ and so on. Finally, using the crucial assumption (A6), we show that the solution becomes bigger this sub-solution after a finite time, and then, because of the comparison principle (A4), one gets (1.15), see Theorem 4.9.

Section 5 contains the proof of (1.16). As a matter of fact, we prove it for a solution to the linear equation (1.19). Then, because of (1.20), one gets the same result for a solution to (1.1) with an arbitrary G, such that (A2) holds. Namely, we show that if, for some bounded function ω on $\mathbb{R}^d$, $(a * \omega)(x) \le (1+\delta)\omega(x)$, for any small $\delta > 0$, provided that $\omega(x) \le \lambda$, for some small $\lambda = \lambda(\delta) > 0$, then (1.16) holds true with $\mathscr{O}_t$ constructed by this ω (namely, $x \notin \mathscr{O}_t$ means that $\omega(x) \le e^{-(1+\varepsilon)\beta t}$, cf. the above), see Proposition 5.1, Proposition 5.2, Theorem 5.4. Note that, for a light-tailed a, considered in [28], one can take $\omega(x) = \exp(\nu x \cdot \xi)$, where $\nu > 0$, ξ is an arbitrary unit vector in $\mathbb{R}^d$, and the dot means the scalar product in $\mathbb{R}^d$. For the heavy-tailed case, we prove that ω may be chosen equal to $b(|x|)^\alpha$ or $\int_{\Delta(x)} b(|y|)^\alpha\, dy$, and so on, for any $\alpha \in (0,1)$ which is close to 1. Finally, in Theorem 5.17, we show how to exclude α from the description of $\mathscr{O}_t$.

Section 6 combines the results above, in a more explicit form under the assumptions (1.24) and (1.25), to get there sharp result in the sense of (1.17). We consider there also particular examples, where we use the results of Section 2, to describe $\mathscr{O}_t$ and $\mathscr{C}_t$ explicitly. Finally, in Section 7, we accumulate the upper and lower estimates for the solution to both nonlinear equation (1.1) and linear equation (1.19) in light- and heavy-tailed cases.

2 Technical tools on $\mathbb{R}$

2.1 Functions with heavy tails on $\mathbb{R}$

Definition 2.1. A function $b : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ is said to be *(right-side) long-tailed* if there exists $\rho = \rho_b \ge 0$, such that $b(s) > 0$ for all $s \ge \rho$; and, for any $\tau \ge 0$,

$$\lim_{s\to\infty} \frac{b(s+\tau)}{b(s)} = 1. \tag{2.1}$$

Remark 2.2. By [30, formula (2.18)], the convergence in (2.1) is equivalent to the locally uniform in τ convergence, namely, (2.1) can be replaced by the assumption that, for all $h > 0$,

$$\lim_{s\to\infty} \sup_{|\tau|\le h} \left| \frac{b(s+\tau)}{b(s)} - 1 \right| = 0. \tag{2.2}$$

A long-tailed function has to have a 'heavier' tail than any exponential function; namely, the following statement holds.

Lemma 2.3 ([30, Lemma 2.17]). *Let $b : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ be a long-tailed function. Then, for any $k > 0$,*

$$\lim_{s\to\infty} e^{ks} b(s) = \infty. \tag{2.3}$$

The constant h in (2.2) may be arbitrary big. It is quite natural to ask what will be if h increases to ∞ consistently with s.

Lemma 2.4 (cf. [30, Lemma 2.19, Proposition 2.20]). *Let $b : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ be a long-tailed function. Then there exists a function $h : (0,\infty) \to (0,\infty)$, with $h(s) < \frac{s}{2}$ and $\lim_{s\to\infty} h(s) = \infty$, such that, cf.* (2.2),

$$\lim_{s\to\infty} \sup_{|\tau|\le h(s)} \left| \frac{b(s+\tau)}{b(s)} - 1 \right| = 0. \tag{2.4}$$

We will say then that b is h-insensitive. Of course, for a given long-tailed function b the function h that fulfills (2.4) is not unique, see also [30, Proposition 2.20].

The convergence in (2.1) may be, in general, very 'non-regular' in s. Evidently, if $b(s)$ is decreasing for big values of s, then the l.h.s. of (2.1) converges to 1 from below (for $\tau \ge 0$). Let us specify the corresponding class of functions.

Definition 2.5. A function $b : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ is said to be *(right-side) tail-decreasing* if there exists a number $\rho = \rho_b \ge 0$ such that $b = b(s)$ is strictly decreasing on $[\rho,\infty)$ to 0. In particular, $b(s) > 0$, $s \ge \rho$.

Proposition 2.6. *Let $b : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ be a tail-decreasing function. Let $h : (0,\infty) \to (0,\infty)$, with $h(s) < \frac{s}{2}$ and $\lim_{s\to\infty} h(s) = \infty$. Then* (2.4) *holds, if and only if*

$$\lim_{s\to\infty} \frac{b(s \pm h(s))}{b(s)} = 1. \tag{2.5}$$

Proof. Let $\rho = \rho_b > 0$ be as in the Definition 2.5. Then, for the given h and for any $s > 2\rho$, one has that $s - h(s) > \frac{s}{2} > \rho$. Hence, for a fixed $s > 2\rho$, the function $b(s+\tau)$ is decreasing in $\tau \in [-h(s), h(s)]$. Therefore, considering separately positive and negative τ, one gets that, for all $s > 2\rho$,

$$\sup_{|\tau|\le h(s)} \left| \frac{b(s+\tau)}{b(s)} - 1 \right| = \max\left\{ 1 - \frac{b(s+h(s))}{b(s)}, \frac{b(s-h(s))}{b(s)} - 1 \right\},$$

that yields the statement. □

However, even for a long-tailed tail-decreasing function b, the convergence in (2.1) will not be, in general, monotone in s. To get this monotonicity, we consider the following class of functions.

Definition 2.7. A function $b : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ is said to be *(right-side) tail-log-convex*, if there exists $\rho = \rho_b > 0$ such that $b(s) > 0$, $s \ge \rho$, and the function $\log b$ is convex on $[\rho,\infty)$.

Remark 2.8. It is well-known that any function which is convex on an open interval is continuous there. Therefore, a tail-log-convex function $b = \exp(\log b)$ is continuous on (ρ_b, ∞) as well.

Lemma 2.9. *Let $b : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ be tail-log-convex, with $\rho = \rho_b$. Then, for any $\tau > 0$, the function $\dfrac{b(s+\tau)}{b(s)}$ is non-decreasing in $s \in [\rho, \infty)$.*

Proof. Take any $s_1 > s_2 \geq \rho$. Set $B(s) := \log b(s) \leq 0$, $s \in [\rho, \infty)$. Then the desired inequality

$$\frac{b(s_1+\tau)}{b(s_1)} \geq \frac{b(s_2+\tau)}{b(s_2)}$$

is equivalent to

$$B(s_1+\tau) + B(s_2) \geq B(s_2+\tau) + B(s_1).$$

Since B is convex, we have, for $\lambda = \dfrac{\tau}{s_1 - s_2 + \tau} \in (0,1)$,

$$B(s_1) = B\big(\lambda s_2 + (1-\lambda)(s_1+\tau)\big) \leq \lambda B(s_2) + (1-\lambda)B(s_1+\tau),$$
$$B(s_2+\tau) = B\big((1-\lambda)s_2 + \lambda(s_1+\tau)\big) \leq (1-\lambda)B(s_2) + \lambda B(s_1+\tau),$$

that implies the needed inequality. □

The next statement describes a crucial property of a long-tailed tail-log-convex function which decays at ∞ fast enough.

Lemma 2.10 (cf. [30, Theorem 4.15])**.** *Let $b : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ be a long-tailed tail-log-convex function such that $b \in L^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$. Suppose that, for a function $h : (0,\infty) \to (0,\infty)$, with $h(s) < \dfrac{s}{2}$ and $\lim\limits_{s\to\infty} h(s) = \infty$, the asymptotic* (2.4) *holds, and that*

$$\lim_{s\to\infty} s\, b\big(h(s)\big) = 0. \tag{2.6}$$

Set

$$b_+(s) := \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+}(s)\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} b(\tau)d\tau\right)^{-1} b(s), \quad s \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{2.7}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}(b_+ * b_+)(s) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} b_+(s-\tau)b_+(\tau)\,d\tau \\ &= \int_0^s b_+(s-\tau)b_+(\tau)\,d\tau \sim 2b_+(s), \quad s\to\infty.\end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

In the literature, see e.g. [30], a long-tailed probability density b_+ on $\mathbb{R}_+$ that satisfies (2.8) is called a *sub-exponential density* on $\mathbb{R}_+$. This gives a reason for the following definition.

Definition 2.11. We will say that a function $b : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ is *weakly (right-side) sub-exponential on* $\mathbb{R}$ if b is long-tailed, $b \in L^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$, and the function b_+, being defined by (2.7), satisfies (2.8).

Remark 2.12. Let $b : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ be a weakly sub-exponential function on $\mathbb{R}$. Then, by (2.7), (2.8), we have

$$\int_0^s b(s-\tau)b(\tau)\,d\tau \sim 2\Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} b(\tau)d\tau\Big)b(s), \quad s \to \infty.$$

Suppose, additionally, that $b \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$. Then, in general, the asymptotic, cf. (2.8),

$$(b * b)(s) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} b(s-\tau)b(\tau)\,d\tau \sim 2\Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}} b(\tau)d\tau\Big)b(s), \quad s \to \infty \tag{2.9}$$

may not hold; one needs an additional condition on b, see (2.10) below.

Definition 2.13. We will say that a function $b : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ is *strongly (right-side) sub-exponential on* $\mathbb{R}$ if b is long-tailed, $b \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$, and the asymptotic (2.9) holds.

Remark 2.14. By [30, Lemma 4.12], a strongly sub-exponential function on $\mathbb{R}$ is weakly sub-exponential there.

Lemma 2.15 (cf. [30, Lemma 4.13])**.** *Let $b \in L^1(\mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_+)$ be a weakly sub-exponential function on $\mathbb{R}$. Suppose that there exists $\rho = \rho_b > 0$ and $K = K_b > 0$ such that*

$$b(s+\tau) \le Kb(s), \quad s > \rho,\ \tau > 0. \tag{2.10}$$

Then (2.9) *holds, i.e. b is strongly sub-exponential on $\mathbb{R}$.*

Remark 2.16. Evidently, a tail-decreasing function defined by Definition 2.5 satisfies (2.10), with the same ρ and $K = 1$.

It is naturally to expect that asymptotically small changes in the behavior at infinity preserves the sub-exponential property of a function. Namely, consider the following definition.

Definition 2.17. Two functions $b_1, b_2 : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ are said to be *weakly tail-equivalent* if

$$0 < \liminf_{s\to\infty} \frac{b_1(s)}{b_2(s)} \le \limsup_{s\to\infty} \frac{b_1(s)}{b_2(s)} < \infty, \tag{2.11}$$

or, in other words, if there exist $\rho > 0$ and $C_2 \ge C_1 > 0$, such that,

$$C_1 b_1(s) \le b_2(s) \le C_2 b_1(s), \quad s \ge \rho. \tag{2.12}$$

Proposition 2.18. *Let $b_1 : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ be a weakly sub-exponential on $\mathbb{R}$ function. Let $b_2 : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ be a long-tailed function which is weakly tail-equivalent to b_1. Then b_2 is weakly sub-exponential on $\mathbb{R}$ as well. If, additionally,* (2.10) *holds for $b = b_1$, then b_2 is strongly sub-exponential on $\mathbb{R}$.*

Proof. Let b_1 be weakly sub-exponential on $\mathbb{R}$, cf. Definition 2.11, and the functions $b_{1,+}$ and $b_{2,+}$ be defined according to (2.7). Then, evidently, $b_{1,+}$ and $b_{2,+}$ will be also weakly tail-equivalent, and, moreover, $b_{2,+}$ will be long-tailed. Then, by [30, Theorem 4.8], $b_{2,+}$ is a also sub-exponential density on $\mathbb{R}_+$, i.e. (2.8)

holds for $b_+ = b_{2,+}$. As a result, by Definition 2.11, b_2 is weakly sub-exponential on $\mathbb{R}$. Next, let (2.10) holds for $b = b_1$. Then, by (2.12), we have, for all $s \geq \rho$,

$$b_2(s+\tau) \leq C_2 b_1(s+\tau) \leq C_2 K b_1(s) \leq \frac{C_2}{C_1} K b_2(s),$$

i.e. (2.10) holds for $b = b_2$ as well. As a result, by Lemma 2.15, both b_1 and b_2 are strongly sub-exponential on $\mathbb{R}$. □

We consider a useful for the sequel class of functions.

Definition 2.19. Let $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ be the set of all functions $b : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ such that

1) $b \in L^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$ and b is bounded on $\mathbb{R}$;

2) there exists $\rho = \rho_b > 1$, such that b is log-convex and strictly decreasing to 0 on $[\rho, \infty)$ (i.e. b is simultaneously tail-decreasing and tail-log-convex), and (without loss of generality) $b(\rho) \leq 1$;

3) there exist $\delta = \delta_b \in (0,1)$ and an increasing function $h = h_b : (0,\infty) \to (0,\infty)$, with $h(s) < \dfrac{s}{2}$ and $\lim\limits_{s\to\infty} h(s) = \infty$, such that the asymptotic (2.5) holds, and, cf. (2.6),

$$\lim_{s\to\infty} b\big(h(s)\big) s^{1+\delta} = 0. \tag{2.13}$$

For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote by $\mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{R})$ the subclass of functions b from $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ such that

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\rho} b(s)\, ds + \int_{\rho}^{\infty} b(s) s^{n-1}\, ds < \infty. \tag{2.14}$$

Remark 2.20. It is worth noting again that, for a tail-decreasing function, (2.5) implies that b is long-tailed.

Remark 2.21. By Lemma 2.10, any function $b \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ is weakly sub-exponential on $\mathbb{R}$. Moreover, by Lemma 2.15 and Remark 2.16, any function $b \in \mathcal{S}_1(\mathbb{R})$ is strongly sub-exponential on $\mathbb{R}$.

Remark 2.22. Let $b \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$, and $s_0 > 0$ be such that $h(2s_0) > \rho$. Then the monotonicity of b and h implies $b(s) \leq b(h(2s))$, $s > s_0$; and hence, because of (2.13), for $B := 2^{-1-\delta}$, there exists $s_1 \geq s_0$, such that

$$b(s) \leq \frac{B}{s^{1+\delta}}, \quad s \geq s_1. \tag{2.15}$$

Below we will show that $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ and $\mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{R})$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ are closed under some simple transformations of functions. For an arbitrary function $b \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$, we consider the following transformed functions:

1) for fixed $p > 0$, $q > 0$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$, we set

$$\widetilde{b}(s) := p b(qs + r), \quad s \in \mathbb{R}; \tag{2.16}$$

2) for a fixed $s_0 > 0$ and a fixed bounded function $c : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_+$, we set

$$\breve{b}(s) := \mathbb{1}_{(-\infty, s_0)}(s) c(s) + \mathbb{1}_{[s_0,\infty)}(s) b(s), \quad s \in \mathbb{R}; \tag{2.17}$$

3) for any $\alpha \in (0,1]$, we denote

$$b_\alpha(s) := \big(b(s)\big)^\alpha, \quad s \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Theorem 2.23. *1) Let $b \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$. Then the functions $\widetilde{b}$ and $\breve{b}$ defined in* (2.16) *and* (2.17)*, correspondingly, also belong to $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ for all admissible values of their parameters. If, additionally, there exists $\alpha' \in (0,1)$ such that $b_{\alpha'} \in L^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$, then there exists $\alpha_0 \in (\alpha', 1)$, such that $b_\alpha \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ for all $\alpha \in [\alpha_0, 1]$.*

2) Let $b \in \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{R})$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $\widetilde{b} \in \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{R})$. If, additionally, the function c in (2.17) *is integrable on $(-\infty, s_0)$, then $\breve{b} \in \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{R})$. Finally, if there exists $\alpha' \in (0,1)$ such that* (2.14) *holds for $b = b_{\alpha'}$, then there exists $\alpha_0 \in (\alpha', 1)$, such that $b_\alpha \in \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{R})$ for all $\alpha \in [\alpha_0, 1]$. Moreover, in the latter case, there exist $B_0 > 0$ and $\rho_0 > 0$, such that, for all $\alpha \in (\alpha_0, 1]$,*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \big(b(s-\tau)\big)^\alpha \big(b(\tau)\big)^\alpha \, d\tau \le B_0 \big(b(s)\big)^\alpha, \quad s \ge \rho_0, \tag{2.18}$$

Proof. It is very straightforward to check that if b is long-tailed, tail-decreasing and tail-log-convex, then $\widetilde{b}, \breve{b}, b_\alpha$ also have these properties for all admissible values of their parameters. Let $h : (0,\infty) \to (0,\infty)$ be such that $h(s) < \dfrac{s}{2}$, $\lim\limits_{s\to\infty} h(s) = \infty$, and (2.5) hold. Let also (2.13) hold for some $\delta > 0$.

(i) Evidently, both (2.5) and (2.13) hold, with b replaced by $\breve{b}$. Next, $\breve{b} \in L^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$ and $\breve{b}$ is bounded. Hence $\breve{b} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$. If $b \in \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{R})$ and c is integrable on $(-\infty, s_0)$, then (2.14) holds for b replaced by $\breve{b}$.

(ii) Set, for the given $q > 0$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\widetilde{h}(s) := \frac{1}{q} h(qs + r) - \frac{r}{2q} \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+}(r), \quad s \in [s_1, \infty),$$

where $s_1 > 0$ is such that $qs_1 + r > 0$ and $h(qs + r) > \frac{r}{2q}$ for all $s \ge s_1$. Clearly, $\widetilde{h}$ is increasing on $[s_1, \infty)$, $\lim\limits_{s\to\infty} \widetilde{h}(s) = \infty$, and $\widetilde{h}(s) \le \frac{1}{2q}(qs + r) - \frac{r}{2q}\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+}(r) \le \frac{s}{2}$ for all $s \in [s_1, \infty)$. The interval $(0, s_1)$ is not so 'important', one can choose any increasing $\widetilde{h}$ there, such that $\widetilde{h}(s) < \min\big\{\frac{s}{2}, \widetilde{h}(s_1)\big\}$, $s \in (0, s_1)$. By Proposition 2.6, (2.5) is equivalent to (2.4). Then, by (2.16), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{|\tau| \le \widetilde{h}(s)} \left| \frac{\widetilde{b}(s+\tau)}{\widetilde{b}(s)} - 1 \right| &= \sup_{q|\tau| \le h(qs+r) - \frac{r}{2}\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+}(r)} \left| \frac{b(qs+r+q\tau)}{b(qs+r)} - 1 \right| \\ &\le \sup_{q|\tau| \le h(qs+r)} \left| \frac{b(qs+r+q\tau)}{b(qs+r)} - 1 \right| \to 0,\end{aligned}$$

as $s \to \infty$. Therefore, again by Proposition 2.6, (2.5) holds for b replaced by $\widetilde{b}$. Next, set $\nu(r) := \frac{r}{2}$, $r \ge 0$, and $\nu(r) := r$, $r < 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{b}\big(\widetilde{h}(s)\big) s^{1+\delta} &= p b\big(h(qs+r) + \nu(r)\big) s^{1+\delta} \\ &= p \frac{b\big(h(qs+r) + \nu(r)\big)}{b\big(h(qs+r)\big)} b\big(h(qs+r)\big)(qs+r)^{1+\delta} \Big(\frac{s}{qs+r}\Big)^{1+\delta} \to 0,\end{aligned}$$

as $s \to \infty$, because of (2.1), (2.13). Therefore, $\widetilde{b} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$. Finally, $b \in \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{R})$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, trivially implies $\widetilde{b} \in \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{R})$.

(iii) Evidently, the convergence (2.5) implies the same one with b replaced by b_α, with the same h and for any $\alpha \in (0,1)$. Next, let $\alpha' \in (0,1)$ be such that $b_{\alpha'} \in L^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$. By the well-known log-convexity of L^p-norms (for $p > 0$), for any $\alpha \in (\alpha', 1)$ and for $\beta := \frac{\alpha-\alpha'}{\alpha(1-\alpha')} \in (0,1)$, we have $\frac{1}{\alpha} = \frac{1-\beta}{\alpha'} + \beta$ and

$$\|b\|_{L^\alpha(\mathbb{R}_+)} \le \|b\|^{1-\beta}_{L^{\alpha'}(\mathbb{R}_+)} \|b\|^{\beta}_{L^1(\mathbb{R}_+)} < \infty, \tag{2.19}$$

i.e. $b_\alpha \in L^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$ for all $\alpha \in (\alpha', 1)$. Take and fix now, an arbitrary $\alpha_0 \in \Big(\max\Big\{\alpha', \frac{1}{1+\delta}\Big\}, 1\Big)$. Then, for any $\alpha \in [\alpha_0, 1]$, we have that $\delta' := \alpha(1+\delta)-1 \in (0, \delta]$, and hence, by (2.13),

$$\lim_{s\to\infty} b_\alpha\big(h(s)\big)s^{1+\delta'} = \lim_{s\to\infty} \Big(b\big(h(s)\big)s^{1+\delta}\Big)^\alpha = 0.$$

Therefore, $b_\alpha \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$, $\alpha \in [\alpha_0, 1]$.

Let, additionally, (2.14) hold for both b and $b_{\alpha'}$ (i.e., in particular, $b \in \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{R})$) and for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then one can use again the log-convexity of L^p-norms, now for $L^p\big((\rho,\infty), s^n\,ds\big)$ spaces, to deduce that $b_\alpha \in \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{R})$, $\alpha \in [\alpha_0, 1]$.

Finally, $b, b_{\alpha_0} \in \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{R})$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, implies $b, b_{\alpha_0} \in \mathcal{S}_1(\mathbb{R})$, and hence, cf. Remark 2.21, b and b_{α_0} are strongly sub-exponential on $\mathbb{R}$, i.e. (2.9) holds for both b and b_{α_0}. Therefore, for an arbitrary $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$, there exists $\rho_0 = \rho_0(\varepsilon, b, b_{\alpha_0}) > \rho$ (where ρ is from Definition 2.19) and

$$B_0 := 2(1+\varepsilon)\max\Big\{\int_{\mathbb{R}} b(s)\,ds, \int_{\mathbb{R}} b_{\alpha_0}(s)\,ds\Big\} > 0,$$

such that, for all $s \ge \rho_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{R}} b(s-\tau)b(\tau)\,d\tau \le B_0 b(s), \\ &\int_{\mathbb{R}} b_{\alpha_0}(s-\tau)b_{\alpha_0}(\tau)\,d\tau \le B_0 b_{\alpha_0}(s). \end{aligned} \tag{2.20}$$

Then, applying again the norm log-convexity arguments, cf. (2.19), one gets, for any fixed $s \ge \rho_0$ and for all $\alpha \in (\alpha_0, 1)$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \big(b(s-\tau)b(\tau)\big)^\alpha d\tau \le \Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \big(b(s-\tau)b(\tau)\big)^{\alpha_0} d\tau\Big)^{\frac{1}{\alpha_0}(1-\beta)\alpha} \Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}} b(s-\tau)b(\tau)d\tau\Big)^{\beta\alpha},$$

where $\beta = \frac{\alpha-\alpha_0}{\alpha(1-\alpha_0)} \in (0,1)$. Combining the latter inequality with (2.20), one gets

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \big(b(s-\tau)b(\tau)\big)^\alpha d\tau \le \big(B_0(b(s))^{\alpha_0}\big)^{\frac{1}{\alpha_0}(1-\beta)\alpha} \big(B_0 b(s)\big)^{\beta\alpha} = B_0\big(b(s)\big)^\alpha.$$

The theorem is fully proved now. □

By Definition 2.19, to check whether a function b belongs to $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$, one naturally needs a precise information about an appropriate function h, such

that (2.5) holds, cf. the proof of Theorem 2.23. However, if $b_1 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ and b_2 is weakly tail-equivalent to b_1, then, besides of Proposition 2.18, one can not find, in general, an appropriate function h_2 for b_2 such that the analogue of (2.5) and (2.13) would simultaneously hold, having the corresponding function h_1 for b_1 only. Fortunately, we will need results of such type for the functions which are asymptotically tail-proportional only; the latter means that the limits in (2.11) will coincide (and, as a result, the constants C_1 and C_2 in (2.12) will be 'almost equal'). Consider the corresponding statement.

Proposition 2.24. *Let $b_1 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ and let $b_2 : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ be a bounded tail-decreasing and tail-log-convex function, such that*

$$\lim_{s\to\infty} \frac{b_2(s)}{b_1(s)} = C \in (0,\infty). \tag{2.21}$$

Then $b_2 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$.

Proof. First, we note that (2.21), (2.1) yield that b_2 is long-tailed as b_1 is such. Let $\delta \in (0,1)$ and $h : (0,\infty) \to (0,\infty)$ be an increasing function, such that $h(s) < \dfrac{s}{2}$, $\lim\limits_{s\to\infty} h(s) = \infty$, and (2.5) and (2.13) hold for $b = b_1$. Next, take an arbitrary $\varepsilon \in \big(0, \min\{1, C\}\big)$. Choose $\rho > 1$ such that b_2 is decreasing and log-convex on $[\rho,\infty)$, and $b_2(\rho) \le 1$. By (2.21) and (2.5) (for $b = b_1$), there exists $\rho_1 \ge \rho$, such that, for all $s \ge \rho_1$,

$$0 < (C-\varepsilon)b_1(s) \le b_2(s) \le (C+\varepsilon)b_1(s), \tag{2.22}$$

$$\left|\frac{b_1(s \pm h(s))}{b_1(s)} - 1\right| < \varepsilon. \tag{2.23}$$

Since b_2 is bounded and $b_1 \in L^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$, we have from (2.22) that $b_2 \in L^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$. Moreover, by (2.22), for any $s \ge 2\rho_1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{C-\varepsilon}{C+\varepsilon}\left(\frac{b_1(s \pm h(s))}{b_1(s)} - 1\right) + \frac{C-\varepsilon}{C+\varepsilon} &= \frac{(C-\varepsilon)b_1(s \pm h(s))}{(C+\varepsilon)b_1(s)} \\
&\le \frac{b_2(s \pm h(s))}{b_2(s)} \\
&\le \frac{(C+\varepsilon)b_1(s \pm h(s))}{(C-\varepsilon)b_1(s)} = \frac{C+\varepsilon}{C-\varepsilon}\left(\frac{b_1(s \pm h(s))}{b_1(s)} - 1\right) + \frac{C+\varepsilon}{C-\varepsilon},
\end{aligned}$$

and, therefore, by (2.23),

$$\left|\frac{b_2(s \pm h(s))}{b_2(s)} - 1\right| < \max\left\{\varepsilon\frac{C+\varepsilon}{C-\varepsilon} + \frac{C+\varepsilon}{C-\varepsilon} - 1,\ \varepsilon\frac{C-\varepsilon}{C+\varepsilon} + 1 - \frac{C-\varepsilon}{C+\varepsilon}\right\}.$$

Since the latter expression may be arbitrary small, by an appropriate choice of ε, one gets that (2.5) holds for $b = b_2$. Finally, (2.13) for $b = b_1$, and (2.21) imply that (2.13) holds for $b = b_2$ and the same δ and h. □

Remark 2.25. In the assumptions of the previous theorem, if, additionally, $b_1 \in \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{R})$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and b_2 is integrable on $(-\infty, -\rho_2)$ for some $\rho_2 > 0$, then $b_2 \in \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{R})$ (because of (2.22) and the boundedness of b_2).

On the other hand, if one can check that both functions b_1 and b_2 satisfy (2.5) with the same function $h(s)$, then the sufficient condition to verify (2.13) for $b = b_2$, provided that it holds for $b = b_1$, is much weaker than (2.21). To present the corresponding statement, consider the following definition.

Definition 2.26. Let $b_1, b_2 : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ and, for some $\rho \geq 0$, $b_i(s) > 0$ for all $s \in [\rho, \infty)$, $i = 1, 2$. The functions b_1 and b_2 are said to be *(asymptotically) log-equivalent*, if

$$\log b_1(s) \sim \log b_2(s), \quad s \to \infty. \tag{2.24}$$

Proposition 2.27. *Let $b_1 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ and let h be the function corresponding to Definition 2.19 with $b = b_1$. Let $b_2 : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ be a bounded tail-decreasing and tail-log-convex function, such that (2.5) holds with $b = b_2$ and the same h. Suppose that b_1 and b_2 are log-equivalent. Then $b_2 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$. If, additionally, there exists $\alpha' \in (0, 1)$, such that (2.14) holds with $b = (b_1)^{\alpha'}$ and b_2 is integrable on $(-\infty, \rho)$, then $b_2 \in \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{R})$.*

Proof. Let $\delta \in (0, 1)$ be such that (2.13) holds for b replaced by b_1. Take an arbitrary $\varepsilon \in \big(0, \frac{\delta}{1+\delta}\big)$. By (2.24), there exists $\rho_\varepsilon > 0$, such that $b_i(s) < 1$, $s > \rho_\varepsilon$, $i = 1, 2$, and

$$\begin{gathered} -(1-\varepsilon)\log b_1(s) \leq -\log b_2(s) \leq -(1+\varepsilon)\log b_1(s), \quad s > \rho_\varepsilon, \\ b_1(s)^{1+\varepsilon} \leq b_2(s) \leq b_1(s)^{1-\varepsilon}, \quad s > \rho_\varepsilon. \end{gathered} \tag{2.25}$$

Since $h(s) \to \infty$, $s \to \infty$, there exists $\rho_0 > \rho_\varepsilon$, such that $h(s) > \rho_\varepsilon$ for any $s > \rho_0$. Then, by (2.25), we have, for all $s > \rho_0$,

$$b_2(h(s))s^{(1+\delta)(1-\varepsilon)} < b_1(h(s))^{1-\varepsilon} s^{(1+\delta)(1-\varepsilon)} = \big(b_1(h(s))s^{1+\delta}\big)^{1-\varepsilon},$$

and therefore, (2.13) holds with $b = b_2$ and δ replaced by

$$(1+\delta)(1-\varepsilon) - 1 = \delta - \varepsilon(1+\delta) \in (0, 1),$$

that proves the first statement. To prove the second one, assume, additionally, that $\varepsilon < 1 - \alpha'$. Then, by (2.25), we have, for all $s > \rho_\varepsilon$,

$$b_2(s)s^{n-1} \leq b_1(s)^{1-\varepsilon} s^{n-1} < b_1(s)^{\alpha'} s^{n-1},$$

as $b_1(s) < 1$ here. □

2.2 Level sets for heavy tailed functions on $\mathbb{R}$

Let $b : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ be a tail-decreasing function, cf. Definition 2.5. Choose and fix the corresponding $\rho > 1$, such that $b(\rho) \leq 1$. We will consider time dependent level sets of the function b, namely, we are interested in the sets $\{s \in \mathbb{R} : b(s) \leq e^{-\beta t}\}$ for different $\beta > 0$ and $t > 0$.

For arbitrary $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $\beta > 0$ one can define the following constants

$$\beta_\varepsilon^- := (1-\varepsilon)\beta > 0, \qquad \beta_\varepsilon^+ := (1+\varepsilon)\beta > 0. \tag{2.26}$$

For any tail-decreasing function b as the above, we can consider the inverse function $b^{-1} = b^{-1}(s)$ for $s \in \big(0, b(\rho)\big]$, which is decreasing there. For an arbitrary $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$, we set

$$t^{\pm}_{\rho,\varepsilon} = t^{\pm}_{\rho,\varepsilon}(b) := -\frac{1}{\beta^{\pm}_{\varepsilon}} \log b(\rho) \geq 0. \tag{2.27}$$

Since $\big(0, b(\rho)\big] \subset (0,1]$, one can define, for $t \geq t^{-}_{\rho,\varepsilon} > t^{+}_{\rho,\varepsilon}$, all the following functions

$$\eta(t) = \eta(t,b) := b^{-1}\big(e^{-\beta t}\big), \tag{2.28}$$

$$\eta^{+}_{\varepsilon}(t) = \eta^{+}_{\varepsilon}(t,b) := \eta\big((1+\varepsilon)t\big) = b^{-1}\big(e^{-\beta^{+}_{\varepsilon} t}\big), \tag{2.29}$$

$$\eta^{-}_{\varepsilon}(t) = \eta^{-}_{\varepsilon}(t,b) := \eta\big((1-\varepsilon)t\big) = b^{-1}\big(e^{-\beta^{-}_{\varepsilon} t}\big). \tag{2.30}$$

Clearly, all these functions are increasing to ∞, and

$$\eta^{+}_{\varepsilon}(t) \geq \eta(t) \geq \eta^{-}_{\varepsilon}(t) \geq \rho, \qquad t \geq t^{-}_{\rho,\varepsilon}. \tag{2.31}$$

Lemma 2.28. *Let $b : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ be tail-decreasing and long-tailed. Then, for any $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ and for any $c > 0$,*

$$\eta^{-}_{\varepsilon}(t) - ct \to \infty, \quad t \to \infty.$$

Proof. Since b is long-tailed, (2.3) holds for any $k > 0$. Therefore, one has

$$\begin{aligned}\exp\Big(\frac{\beta^{-}_{\varepsilon}}{c}\big(\eta^{-}_{\varepsilon}(t) - ct\big)\Big) &= \exp\Big(\frac{\beta^{-}_{\varepsilon}}{c}\eta^{-}_{\varepsilon}(t)\Big)e^{-\beta^{-}_{\varepsilon} t} \\ &= \exp\Big(\frac{\beta^{-}_{\varepsilon}}{c}\eta^{-}_{\varepsilon}(t)\Big)b(\eta^{-}_{\varepsilon}(t)) \to \infty, \quad t \to \infty. \qquad \square\end{aligned}$$

Since $\eta(t)$ is an increasing function, one gets that, for any $0 < \varepsilon_1 < \varepsilon_2 < 1$, one has (cf. 2.27)

$$\eta^{-}_{\varepsilon_2}(t) \leq \eta^{-}_{\varepsilon_1}(t) \leq \eta^{+}_{\varepsilon_1}(t) \leq \eta^{+}_{\varepsilon_2}(t), \qquad t \geq t^{-}_{\rho,\varepsilon_2} > t^{-}_{\rho,\varepsilon_1}. \tag{2.32}$$

The following simple lemma shows that the latter inequalities hold for different big enough times as well.

Lemma 2.29. *Let $b : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ be a tail-decreasing function. For any $0 < \varepsilon_1 < \varepsilon_2 < 1$ and for any $t_1, t_2 \geq t^{-}_{\rho,\varepsilon_2} > t^{-}_{\rho,\varepsilon_1}$, there exists $\tau = \tau(t_1, t_2, \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2) \geq 0$, such that, for all $t \geq \tau$,*

$$\eta^{-}_{\varepsilon_2}(t_2 + t) \leq \eta^{-}_{\varepsilon_1}(t_1 + t) \leq \eta^{+}_{\varepsilon_1}(t_1 + t) \leq \eta^{+}_{\varepsilon_2}(t_2 + t). \tag{2.33}$$

Proof. By (2.31), all expressions in (2.33) are not smaller than ρ. Since b is decreasing on $[\rho, \infty)$, we have from (2.29), (2.30), that (2.33) is equivalent to

$$e^{-\beta^{-}_{\varepsilon_2}(t+t_2)} \geq e^{-\beta^{-}_{\varepsilon_1}(t+t_1)} \geq e^{-\beta^{+}_{\varepsilon_1}(t+t_1)} \geq e^{-\beta^{+}_{\varepsilon_2}(t+t_2)},$$

that always holds if only, cf. (2.26),

$$t \geq \frac{1}{\varepsilon_2 - \varepsilon_1} \max\big\{0, t_2(1-\varepsilon_2) - t_1(1-\varepsilon_1), t_1(1+\varepsilon_1) - t_2(1+\varepsilon_2)\big\} \geq 0.$$

The statement is proved. $\square$

Moreover, $\eta(t,b)$ is 'increasing' in function b as well. Namely, one has the following result.

Lemma 2.30. *Let $b_1, b_2 : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ be two tail-decreasing functions, such that, for some $\rho \geq \max\{\rho_{b_1}, \rho_{b_2}\}$ (cf. Definition 2.5),*

$$0 < b_1(s) \leq b_2(s), \quad s \geq \rho. \tag{2.34}$$

Then, for any $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ and $t \geq -\frac{1}{\beta_\varepsilon^-} \log b_1(\rho)$,

$$\eta_\varepsilon^\pm(t, b_1) \leq \eta_\varepsilon^\pm(t, b_2).$$

Proof. First of all, note that, by (2.34) and the tail-decreasing property of b_1, b_2, we have, setting $\rho_i = \rho_{b_i}$, $i = 1, 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{1}{\beta_\varepsilon^-} \log b_1(\rho) &\geq \max\Big\{-\frac{1}{\beta_\varepsilon^-} \log b_2(\rho), -\frac{1}{\beta_\varepsilon^-} \log b_1(\rho_1)\Big\} \\ &\geq \max\Big\{-\frac{1}{\beta_\varepsilon^-} \log b_2(\rho_2), -\frac{1}{\beta_\varepsilon^-} \log b_1(\rho_1)\Big\} = \max\big\{t^-_{\varepsilon,\rho_1}(b_1), t^-_{\varepsilon,\rho_2}(b_2)\big\}. \end{aligned}$$

Next,

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_\varepsilon^\pm(t, b_2) &= b_2^{-1}(e^{-\beta_\varepsilon^\pm t}) = b_2^{-1}\big(b_1(\eta_\varepsilon^\pm(t, b_1))\big) \\ &\geq b_2^{-1}\big(b_2(\eta_\varepsilon^\pm(t, b_1))\big) = \eta_\varepsilon^\pm(t, b_1), \end{aligned}$$

where we used that b_2^{-1} decreases and (2.34) holds for $s = \eta_\varepsilon^\pm(t, b_1) \geq \rho$. □

The following statement shows that for 'logarithmically equivalent' functions the corresponding values of η_ε are quite close.

Proposition 2.31. *Let $b_1, b_2 : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ be two tail-decreasing functions which are log-equivalent, i.e. (2.24) holds. Then, for any $0 < \varepsilon_1 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_2 < 1$, there exists $\tau = \tau(\varepsilon, \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2) > 0$, such that, for all $t \geq \tau$,*

$$\eta^-_{\varepsilon_2}(t, b_2) \leq \eta^-_\varepsilon(t, b_1) \leq \eta^-_{\varepsilon_1}(t, b_2) \leq \eta^+_{\varepsilon_1}(t, b_2) \leq \eta^+_\varepsilon(t, b_1) \leq \eta^+_{\varepsilon_2}(t, b_2). \tag{2.35}$$

Proof. Let $\rho_0 > 0$ be such that b_1 and b_2 are both positive and decreasing to 0 on $[\rho_0, \infty)$ and $b_i(\rho_0) < 1$, $i = 1, 2$. Let $0 < \varepsilon_1 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_2 < 1$ be fixed.

Consider functions $g_i(s) := -\log b_i(s)$, $s \in \mathbb{R}$, $i = 1, 2$. By (2.24), for a $\delta = \delta(\varepsilon, \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2) \in (0,1)$ which will be specify later, there exists $\rho_\delta > \rho_0$ such that

$$(1-\delta) g_2(s) \leq g_1(s) \leq (1+\delta) g_2(s), \quad s > \rho_\delta. \tag{2.36}$$

By (2.32), (2.27), all expressions in (2.35) are bigger than the number $\min\big\{\eta^-_{\varepsilon_2}(t, b_1), \eta^-_{\varepsilon_2}(t, b_2)\big\}$, provided that $t > \frac{1}{\beta^-_{\varepsilon_2}} \max\big\{-\log b_1(\rho_0), -\log b_2(\rho_0)\big\}$. Then, since $\eta_\varepsilon^\pm(t)$ are increasing to ∞, there exists $\rho = \rho(\varepsilon_2) > \rho_\delta > \rho_0$ and $\tau = \tau(\rho, \rho_\delta) = \tau(\varepsilon, \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2) > 0$, such that all expressions in (2.35) are bigger than ρ, if only $t > \tau$.

Since the functions g_i, $i = 1, 2$ are increasing to ∞ on $[\rho, \infty)$, we have, by (2.29), (2.36),

$$\exp\{-(1+\delta)g_2\big(\eta_\varepsilon^\pm(t,b_1)\big)\} \\ \leq \exp\{-g_1\big(\eta_\varepsilon^\pm(t,b_1)\big)\} = b_1\big(\eta_\varepsilon^\pm(t,b_1)\big) = \exp(-\beta_\varepsilon^\pm t) \\ \leq \exp\{-(1-\delta)g_2\big(\eta_\varepsilon^\pm(t,b_1)\big)\},$$

for all $t > \tau$. Then, by (2.26), we have

$$(1-\delta)g_2\big(\eta_\varepsilon^\pm(t,b_1)\big) < (1\pm\varepsilon)\beta t < (1+\delta)g_2\big(\eta_\varepsilon^\pm(t,b_1)\big), \quad t > \tau.$$

Hence, for $t > \tau$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1+\varepsilon}{1+\delta}\beta t < g_2\big(\eta_\varepsilon^+(t,b_1)\big) < \frac{1+\varepsilon}{1-\delta}\beta t, \\ \frac{1-\varepsilon}{1+\delta}\beta t < g_2\big(\eta_\varepsilon^-(t,b_1)\big) < \frac{1-\varepsilon}{1-\delta}\beta t. \end{aligned} \tag{2.37}$$

It is straightforward to verify that the inequality $\varepsilon_1 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_2$ implies

$$1+\varepsilon_1 < \frac{1+\varepsilon}{1+\delta} < \frac{1+\varepsilon}{1-\delta} < 1+\varepsilon_2, \\ 1-\varepsilon_2 < \frac{1-\varepsilon}{1+\delta} < \frac{1-\varepsilon}{1-\delta} < 1-\varepsilon_1,$$

if only we choose δ such that

$$0 < \delta < \min\left\{\frac{\varepsilon_2-\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon_2}, \frac{\varepsilon-\varepsilon_1}{1+\varepsilon_1}\right\}. \tag{2.38}$$

Then, we get from (2.37)

$$g_2\big(\eta_{\varepsilon_1}^+(t,b_2)\big) < g_2\big(\eta_\varepsilon^+(t,b_1)\big) < g_2\big(\eta_{\varepsilon_2}^+(t,b_2)\big), \\ g_2\big(\eta_{\varepsilon_2}^-(t,b_2)\big) < g_2\big(\eta_\varepsilon^-(t,b_1)\big) < g_2\big(\eta_{\varepsilon_1}^-(t,b_2)\big),$$

for $t > \tau$. Since g_2 is increasing, we obtain the statement. □

Remark 2.32. Note that, by (2.38) and because of the choice of $\tau = \tau(\rho_\delta)$ in the proof above, we have, in general, that $\tau \to \infty$ when either $\varepsilon_1 \nearrow \varepsilon$ or $\varepsilon_2 \searrow \varepsilon$.

Corollary 2.33. *Let $b_1, b_2 : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ be two tail-decreasing functions which are weakly tail-equivalent. Then* (2.35) *holds.*

Proof. The proof follows directly from Proposition 2.31, since the inequalities (2.12) imply (2.24). □

Remark 2.34. In view of Proposition 2.31 and Corollary 2.33, it is natural to consider the case $b_1(s) \sim b_2(s)$, $s \to \infty$. It is evident that then (using the notations of the proof of Proposition 2.31) $\lim\limits_{s\to\infty}(g_1(s) - g_2(s)) = 0$. Then, for any $\delta \in (0,1)$, there exists $\rho_\delta > 0$, such that $|g_1(s) - g_2(s)| < \delta$ for $s > \rho_\delta$. Fix an arbitrary $\varepsilon_0 \in (0,1)$. Then, for any $\delta \in (0,1)$, there exists $\tau = \tau(\delta, \varepsilon_0)$, such that, for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ and for all $t > \tau$, one gets, by (2.32),

$$\eta_\varepsilon^\pm(t,b_i) \geq \eta_{\varepsilon_0}^-(t,b_i) > \rho_\delta, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

As a result, instead of (2.37), one gets

$$\beta_\varepsilon^\pm t - \delta < g_2\big(\eta_\varepsilon^\pm(t,b_1)\big) < \beta_\varepsilon^\pm t + \delta, \quad t > \tau,$$

and the latter inequalities yield

$$\big|g_2\big(\eta_\varepsilon^\pm(t,b_1)\big) - g_2\big(\eta_\varepsilon^\pm(t,b_2)\big)\big| < \delta, \quad t > \tau. \tag{2.39}$$

Stress that τ does not depend on ε, cf. Remark 2.32; in particular, one can put $\varepsilon = 0$. To get from this that $\eta(t,b_1) - \eta(t,b_2) \to 0$ or, better, that $\eta(t,b_1) \sim \eta(t,b_2)$, $t \to \infty$, one needs some additional assumptions on the function g_2. The simplest one is considered in the Subsubsection 2.3.1 below.

2.3 Examples

We consider now main examples of functions $b \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ and describe the corresponding $\eta_\varepsilon^\pm(t,b)$. Because of Propositions 2.27 and 2.31, we will classify these functions 'up to log-equivalence', i.e. by the asymptotic behavior of

$$l(s) := -\log b(s).$$

For all functions b of the same class of log-equivalence the corresponding $\eta_\varepsilon^\pm(t,b)$ will be same 'up to ε'.

Next, taking into account the result of Theorem 2.23 concerning the function $\breve{b}$, it will be enough to define b on some (s_0,∞), $s_0 > 0$ only.

Note also that, by Lemma 2.10, the function b_+ defined by (2.7) is a sub-exponential density on $\mathbb{R}_+$. Therefore, one can use the classical examples of such densities, see e.g. [30]. However, using the result of Theorem 2.23 concerning the function $\widetilde{b}$, one can consider that examples in their 'simplest' forms (ignoring any shifts of the argument or scales of the argument or the function itself). To describe the corresponding $\eta_\varepsilon^\pm(t,\widetilde{b})$, first of all, note that, by (2.16), $\log\widetilde{b}(s) \sim \log b(qs+r)$, $s \to \infty$, therefore, again, the corresponding $\eta_\varepsilon^\pm(t)$ will be the same up to ε. Next, by (2.28) applied for $b_1(s) := b(qs+r)$, one gets

$$\eta_\varepsilon^\pm(t,b_1) = \frac{1}{q}\eta_\varepsilon^\pm(t,b) - \frac{r}{q} \sim \frac{1}{q}\eta_\varepsilon^\pm(t,b), \quad t \to \infty.$$

In other words, a scaling of the function b changes $\eta_\varepsilon^\pm(t,b)$ 'up to ε' only, whereas a scaling of its argument will be 'more essential'.

Now we consider different asymptotics of the function $l(s) = -\log b(s)$. In all particular examples below, it is straightforward to check that each particular bounded functions b is such that $b'(s) < 0$ and $(\log b(s))'' > 0$ for all big enough values of s, i.e. b is tail-decreasing and tail-log-convex.

2.3.1 Class 1: $l(s) \sim D\log s$, $s \to \infty$, $D > 0$

Polynomial decay For a polynomially decreasing function b one can always describe $\eta(t,b)$ explicitly. Namely, let $b : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ be a tail-decreasing function, such that

$$b(s) \sim qs^{-D}, \quad s \to \infty,\ D > 0,\ q > 0. \tag{2.40}$$

Apply arguments of Remark 2.34 to the function $b_1 = b$ and

$$b_2(s) = \mathbb{1}_{(-\infty,1)}(s) + q\mathbb{1}_{[1,\infty)}(s)s^{-D}, \quad s \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Then $b_1(s) \sim b_2(s)$, $s \to \infty$, and assuming $\rho_\delta > 1$ in the above, we will get (2.39) with $g_2(s) = D \log s$, $s > \rho_\delta$. Stress again, that one can put $\varepsilon = 0$. Then, evidently $\eta(t, b_1) \sim \eta(t, b_2)$, $t \to \infty$; and we can find $\eta(t, b_2)$, by solving the equation $b_2\big(\eta(t, b_2)\big) = e^{-\beta t}$. As a result,

$$\eta(t, b) \sim q^{\frac{1}{D}} \exp\Big(\frac{\beta t}{D}\Big), \quad t \to \infty. \tag{2.41}$$

To show when b which satisfies (2.40) belongs to $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$, consider the following example of such b. Namely, let, for an arbitrary $D > 1$,

$$b(s) = \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+}(s)\frac{1}{(1+s)^D}, \quad s \in \mathbb{R}.$$

For an arbitrary $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, consider $h(s) = s^\gamma$, $s > 0$. Then

$$\frac{b(s \pm h(s))}{b(s)} = \left(\frac{1+s}{1+s\pm s^\gamma}\right)^D \to 1, \quad s \to \infty.$$

Finally,

$$b\big(h(s)\big)s^{1+\delta} = \frac{s^{1+\delta}}{(1+s^\gamma)^D} \to 0, \quad s \to \infty,$$

provided that we will choose h above with $\gamma \in \big(\frac{1}{D}, 1\big)$ and take $\delta \in (0, \gamma D - 1) \subset (0, 1)$. As a result, $b \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$. Clearly, $b \in \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{R})$ for $D > n$.

Let now $b : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ be a bounded tail-decreasing tail-log-convex function, such that (2.40) holds, with $D > 1$. Then, clearly, $b(s) \sim q(s+1)^{-D}$, $s \to \infty$, and using the previous result and Proposition 2.24, one has that $b \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$. Again, $D > n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, together with the integrability of b on $-\infty$ would lead to $b \in \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{R})$, cf. Remark 2.25. The function $\eta(t, b)$ is described by (2.41).

Consider now several classical examples.

Example 2.35. 1) *Student's t-function.* Let, for $p > \frac{1}{2}$,

$$\mathscr{T}(s) = \frac{1}{(1+s^2)^p}, \quad s > 0.$$

The probability density of Student's t-distribution is given, for $p = \frac{\nu+1}{2}$, $\nu > 0$, by $\frac{\Gamma(\frac{\nu+1}{2})}{\sqrt{\nu\pi}\Gamma(\frac{\nu}{2})}\mathscr{T}\big(\frac{s}{\sqrt{\nu}}\big)$, and extended symmetrically on the whole $\mathbb{R}$. Then $\mathscr{T} \in \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{R})$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, if only $p > \frac{n}{2}$. The case $p = 1$ is referred to the Cauchy distribution, the corresponding function belongs to $\mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{R})$ for $n = 1$ only.

2) *The Lévy function.* Let, for $c > 0$,

$$\mathscr{L}(s) = s^{-\frac{3}{2}} \exp\Big(-\frac{c}{s}\Big), \quad s > 0.$$

The probability density of the Lévy distribution is $\sqrt{\frac{c}{\pi}}\mathscr{L}(s-\mu)$, $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$, $s > \mu$.

3) *The Burr function.* Let, for $c > 0$, $k > 0$,

$$\mathscr{B}(s) = \frac{s^{c-1}}{(1+s^c)^{k+1}}, \quad s > 0.$$

The probability density of the so-called Burr IV distribution is just $ck\mathscr{B}(s)$. Note that the case $c = 1$ is related to the Pareto distribution; the latter has the density $kp^k\mathscr{B}(s-1)\mathbb{1}_{[p,\infty)}(s)$ for any $p > 0$.

Logarithmic perturbation of the polynomial decay Let $D > 1$, $\nu \in \mathbb{R}$, and

$$b(s) = \mathbb{1}_{(1,\infty)}(s)\frac{(\log s)^\nu}{s^D}, \quad s \in \mathbb{R}.$$

We are going to apply Proposition 2.27 now, with $b_1(s) = s^{-D}$ and $b_2(s) = (\log s)^\nu s^{-D}$. Indeed, then (2.24) evidently holds. It remains to check that (2.5) holds for both b_1 and b_2 with the same $h(s) = s^\gamma$, $\gamma \in (0,1)$. One has

$$\frac{\log(s \pm s^\gamma)}{\log s} = \frac{\log s + \log\bigl(1 \pm s^{\gamma-1}\bigr)}{\log s} \to 1, \quad s \to \infty,$$

that yields the needed. The corresponding $\eta_\varepsilon^\pm(t,b)$ can be estimated by (2.41) using (2.35).

2.3.2 Class 2: $l(s) \sim D(\log s)^q$, $s \to \infty$, $q > 1$, $D > 0$

Consider the function

$$N(s) := \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+}(s)\exp\bigl(-D(\log s)^q\bigr), \quad s \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Take $h(s) = \mathbb{1}_{[\rho,\infty)}(s)s^{\frac{1}{q}}$, where $\rho > 1$ is chosen such that $h(s) < \frac{s}{2}$ for $s \geq \rho$. Prove that (2.5) holds. We have

$$\frac{N(s \pm h(s))}{N(s)} = \exp\biggl\{D(\log s)^q\biggl(1 - \Bigl(1 + \frac{\log(1 \pm s^{\frac{1}{q}-1})}{\log s}\Bigr)^q\biggr)\biggr\}.$$

Since $q > 1$, we have that $t(s) := \dfrac{\log(1 \pm s^{\frac{1}{q}-1})}{\log s} \to 0$, $s \to \infty$. Redefine then ρ to have that $|t(s)| < 1$, if only $s > \rho$. Use the binomial series

$$(1+t)^\alpha = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\binom{\alpha}{k}t^k, \quad \alpha > 0, \tag{2.42}$$

which converges for $|t| < 1$. One gets then (for $\alpha = q$)

$$\frac{N(s \pm h(s))}{N(s)} = \exp\biggl(-D(\log s)^q\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\binom{q}{k}t(s)^k\biggr) \to 1, \quad s \to \infty.$$

Indeed, using the well-known inequality

$$\left|\binom{\alpha}{k}\right| \leq \frac{M}{k^{1+\alpha}}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N},\ M = M(\alpha), \tag{2.43}$$

one gets, for any $s > \rho$,

$$\left| -D(\log s)^q \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \binom{q}{k} t(s)^k \right| \le D(\log s)^q |t(s)| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{M}{k^{1+q}} \to 0, \quad s \to \infty,$$

since the latter series converges, and, for $q > 1$,

$$(\log s)^q |t(s)| \sim (\log s)^{q-1} s^{\frac{1}{q}-1} \to 0, \quad s \to \infty.$$

Finally, for any $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$N\big(s^{\frac{1}{q}}\big) s^{1+\delta} = \exp\big(-Dq^{-q}(\log s)^q + (1+\delta)\log s\big) \to 0, \quad s \to \infty,$$

since $q > 1$.

As a result, $N \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$. Moreover, evidently, $N \in \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{R})$, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. To find $\eta(t, N)$, one has to solve the equation $b(s) = e^{-\beta t}$. One has then

$$\eta(t, N) = \exp\bigg(\Big(\frac{\beta}{D} t\Big)^{\frac{1}{q}}\bigg).$$

We may also consider Proposition 2.27 for $b_1 = b$ and $b_2 = pb$, where b_2 is tail-decreasing and tail-log-convex function, such that $\log p = o(\log b)$ (that is equivalent to $\log b_1 \sim \log b_2$) and p satisfies (2.5) with $h(s) = s^{\frac{1}{q}}$. According to Subsubsection 2.3.1, a natural example of such $p(s)$ might be s^D, $D \in \mathbb{R}$. As a result, then $b_2 \in \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{R})$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The corresponding $\eta_\varepsilon^{\pm}(t, b_2)$ can be estimated then by $\eta_\varepsilon^{\pm}(t, N)$ using (2.35). Consider now a classical example of such function b_2.

Example 2.36. *The log-normal function.* Let, for $\gamma > 0$,

$$\mathscr{N}(s) = \frac{1}{s} \exp\Big(-\frac{(\log s)^2}{2\gamma^2}\Big), \quad s > 0.$$

By the above, $\mathscr{N} \in \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{R})$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The log-normal distribution has the density $\frac{1}{\gamma\sqrt{2\pi}} \mathscr{N}(se^{-\mu})$ for an arbitrary $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$.

2.3.3 Class 3: $l(s) \sim s^\alpha$, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$

Consider, for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, the so-called *fractional exponent*

$$w(s) = \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+}(s) e^{-s^\alpha}, \quad s \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{2.44}$$

Set $h(s) = \mathbb{1}_{[\rho,\infty)}(s)(\log s)^{\frac{2}{\alpha}}$, where $\rho > 0$ is chosen such that $h(s) < \frac{s}{2}$ for $s \ge \rho$. Then, in particular, $t(s) := \dfrac{h(s)}{s} < 1$, $s \ge \rho$. Prove that (2.5) holds. Using (2.42) for $t = \pm t(s)$, one gets

$$\frac{w\big(s \pm h(s)\big)}{w(s)} = \exp\bigg(-s^\alpha \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \binom{\alpha}{k} (\pm t(s))^k\bigg) \to 1, \quad s \to \infty,$$

similarly to the arguments in Subsubsection 2.3.2, by using (2.43) and the evident convergence $s^\alpha t(s) \to 0$, $s \to \infty$, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Finally, for any $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$w\big(h(s)\big) s^{1+\delta} = \exp\big(-(\log s)^2 + (1+\delta)\log s\big) \to 0, \quad s \to \infty.$$

As a result, $w \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$. It is clear also that $w \in \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{R})$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. To find $\eta(t, w)$, one has to solve the equation $e^{-s^\alpha} = e^{-\beta t}$; therefore,

$$\eta(t, w) = (\beta t)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}$$

Similarly to the above, one can show that $pw \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$, provided that, in particular, $\log p = o(\log w)$ and (2.5) holds for $b = p$ and $h(s) = (\log s)^{\frac{2}{\alpha}}$. Again, one can consider $p(s) = s^D$, $D \in \mathbb{R}$, since it satisfies (2.5) with $h(s) = s^\gamma > (\log s)^{\frac{2}{\alpha}}$, $\alpha, \gamma \in (0, 1)$, and big enough s. Consider the corresponding classical example.

Example 2.37. *The Weibull function.* Let, for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$,

$$\mathscr{W}(s) = \frac{\exp(-s^\alpha)}{s^{1-\alpha}}, \quad s \geq \rho > 0.$$

Note that $\int_s^\infty \mathscr{W}(\tau)\, d\tau = \frac{1}{\alpha} w(s)$, where w is given by (2.44). By the above, $\mathscr{W} \in \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{R})$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The probability density of the Weibull distribution is $\frac{\alpha}{\beta}\mathscr{W}\big(\frac{s}{\beta}\big)$, $s > 0$ for any $\beta > 0$. Note that the density itself is unbounded near 0.

2.3.4 Class 4: $l(s) \sim \dfrac{s}{(\log s)^\alpha}$, $\alpha > 1$

Consider also a function which decays 'slightly' slowly than an exponential function. Namely, let, for an arbitrary fixed $\alpha > 1$,

$$g(s) = \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+}(s) \exp\Big(-\frac{s}{(\log s)^\alpha}\Big), \quad s \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Take, for an arbitrary $\gamma \in (1, \alpha)$, $h(s) = (\log s)^\gamma$, $s > 0$; and denote, for a brevity, $p(s) := \dfrac{h(s)}{s} \to 0$, $s \to \infty$. Then, $\log(s + h(s)) = \log s + \log(1 + p(s))$. Set also

$$q(s) = \frac{\log(1 + p(s))}{\log s} \to 0, \quad s \to \infty.$$

Then, for any $s > e^{\alpha+1}$, we have

$$\log \frac{g(s + h(s))}{g(s)} = \frac{s}{(\log s)^\alpha}\Big(1 - \frac{1 + p(s)}{\big(1 + q(s)\big)^\alpha}\Big)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\big(1 + q(s)\big)^\alpha}\left(\alpha \frac{\big(1 + q(s)\big)^\alpha - 1}{\alpha q(s)} \frac{\log(1 + p(s))}{p(s)} (\log s)^{\gamma-\alpha-1} - (\log s)^{\gamma-\alpha}\right)$$

$$\to 0, \quad s \to \infty,$$

as $\gamma < \alpha$; and similarly $\log \dfrac{g(s - h(s))}{g(s)} \to 0$, $s \to \infty$. Therefore, (2.5) holds for $b = g$. Next,

$$\log\big(g(h(s))s^{1+\delta}\big) = -(\log s)\Big(\frac{(\log s)^{\gamma-1}}{\gamma^\alpha (\log\log s)^\alpha} - (1 + \delta)\Big) \to -\infty, \quad s \to \infty,$$

that yields (2.13) for $b = g$. As a result, $g \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$. Again, evidently, $g \in \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{R})$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. To find $\eta(t, g)$, one has to solve the equation $g(s) = e^{-\beta t}$, i.e. $s(\log s)^{-\alpha} = \beta t$. Making substitution $s = e^\tau$, one easily gets

$$-\frac{\tau}{\alpha} e^{-\frac{\tau}{\alpha}} = -\frac{1}{\alpha(\beta t)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}}.$$

Since $s > e^\alpha$ implies $-\frac{\tau}{\alpha} < -1$ and assuming t big enough, to ensure that $-\frac{1}{\alpha(\beta t)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}} > -\frac{1}{e}$, one has that the solution to the latter equation can be given in terms of the negative real branch W_{-1} of Lambert W-function, that is the function such that $W_{-1}(\nu)\exp(W_{-1}(\nu)) = \nu$, $W_{-1}(\nu) < -1$, $\nu \in (-e^{-1}, 0)$. Namely, one gets $-\frac{\tau}{\alpha} = W_{-1}\big(-\alpha^{-1}(\beta t)^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}\big)$, and, therefore

$$\eta(t,g) = \exp\biggl(-\alpha W_{-1}\Big(-\frac{1}{\alpha(\beta t)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}}\Big)\biggr).$$

However, $\exp(-W_{-1}(\nu)) = \nu^{-1}W_{-1}(\nu)$, therefore,

$$\exp(-\alpha W_{-1}(\nu)) = (-\nu)^{-\alpha}(-W_{-1}(\nu))^\alpha,$$

i.e.

$$\eta(t,g) = \alpha^\alpha \beta t\biggl(-W_{-1}\Big(-\frac{1}{\alpha(\beta t)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}}\Big)\biggr)^\alpha, \quad t > \frac{1}{\beta}\Big(\frac{e}{\alpha}\Big)^\alpha.$$

To get a feeling about the behavior of $\eta(t,g)$ for large t, note that $W_{-1}(\nu) \sim \log(-\nu)$, $\nu \to 0-$. As a result,

$$\eta(t,g) \sim \beta t(\log t)^\alpha, \quad t \to \infty. \tag{2.45}$$

Remark 2.38. The analysis of $\eta(t,g)$ above does not require, of course, that $\alpha > 1$. Naturally, $\alpha \in (0,1]$ gives behavior of $g(s)$ more 'close' to the exponential function and then $\eta(t,g)$ in (2.45) would be 'almost linear', cf. Lemma 2.28. Unfortunately, our approach does not cover this case: the analysis above shows that $h(s)$, to fulfill even (2.6), must grow faster than $\log s$, whereas so 'big' $h(s)$ would not fulfill (2.5). In general, Lemma 2.10 gives a sufficient condition only, to get a sub-exponential density on $\mathbb{R}_+$. It can be shown, see e.g. [23, Example 1.4.3], that a probability distribution, whose density b on $\mathbb{R}_+$ is such that $\int_s^\infty b(\tau)\,d\tau \sim g(s)$, $s \to \infty$, with $\alpha > 0$, is a sub-exponential distribution (for the latter definition, see e.g. [30, Definition 3.1]). Then we expect that $b(s) \sim -g'(s)$, $s \to \infty$, and it is easy to see that $\log(-g'(s)) \sim \log g(s)$, $s \to \infty$. Therefore, one can apply Proposition 2.31, to estimate $\eta_\varepsilon^\pm(t,b)$ in terms of $\eta_\varepsilon^\pm(t,g)$, whose asymptotic in t may be obtained from (2.45). It should be stressed though that, in general, sub-exponential property of a distribution does not imply the corresponding property of its density, cf. [30, Section 4.2]. Therefore, we can not state that the function b above is a sub-exponential one for $\alpha \in (0,1]$.

3 Technical tools on $\mathbb{R}^d$

We start with some notations. Consider the Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^d$, $d \geq 1$ and fix the Borel σ-algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ there. All functions in the sequel are supposed to be $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$-measurable; and all subsets of $\mathbb{R}^d$ are supposed to be from $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Through this Section, a $\beta > 0$ is supposed to be fixed.

Let us fix an orthonormal basis $e_1, \ldots, e_d$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$. For any $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$, let $|x|$ denote the Euclidean norm in $\mathbb{R}^d$, and set

$$\begin{aligned} \langle x \rangle &:= \max_{1 \leq j \leq d} x_j \in \mathbb{R}, \\ \Delta(x) &:= \big\{ y \in \mathbb{R}^d : y_j \geq x_j,\ 1 \leq j \leq d \big\}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

Let also $B_R(x_0)$ denote the closed ball with the center at $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and the radius $R > 0$ w.r.t. the Euclidean norm in $\mathbb{R}^d$, unless another norm is specified.

We introduce the following classes of functions.

Definition 3.1. 1) Let $\mathcal{D}_d(\mathbb{R})$ be the set of all bounded functions $b : \mathbb{R} \to (0, \infty)$, such that b is (strictly) decreasing to 0 on $\mathbb{R}_+$ and

$$\int_0^\infty b(s) s^{d-1}\, ds < \infty. \tag{3.2}$$

2) Let $\mathcal{R}$ be the set of all bounded radially symmetric functions $c : \mathbb{R}^d \to (0, \infty)$, such that $c(x) = b(|x|)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ for some $b = b_c \in \mathcal{D}_d(\mathbb{R})$. Note that, because of (3.2), $\mathcal{R} \subset L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

3) Let $\mathcal{M}$ be the set of all bounded functions $c : \mathbb{R}^d \to (0, \infty)$ which satisfy the following monotonicity property: for an arbitrary $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and for any $1 \le j \le d$, the function

$$\mathbb{R} \ni s \mapsto c(x + se_j) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \tag{3.3}$$

is strictly decreasing on $\mathbb{R}$, converges to 0 as $s \to \infty$, and there exists $c_- \in (0, \infty)$, such that, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\lim_{s \to -\infty} c\big(x + (s, \dots, s)\big) = c_-.$$

4) Let $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{M}$ be the set of all functions from $\mathcal{M}$ of the form

$$c(x) = \int_{\Delta(x)} p(y) dy, \qquad p \in \mathcal{R}, \tag{3.4}$$

where $\Delta(x)$ is given by (3.1). Then, clearly, $c_- = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} p(y) dy$.

Definition 3.2. 1) Let $b \in \mathcal{D}_d(\mathbb{R})$. A function $c \in \mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{I}$ is said to be *constructed by* b, if $c(x) = b(|x|)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ (if $c \in \mathcal{R}$) or $c(x) = \int_{\Delta(x)} b(|y|) dy$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ (if $c \in \mathcal{I}$).

2) Let $b \in \mathcal{D}_d(\mathbb{R})$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ be such that $b^\alpha \in \mathcal{D}_d(\mathbb{R})$. Let $c \in \mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{I}$ be constructed by b. Then we denote by $c_\alpha \in \mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{I}$ the function constructed by b^α; in other words, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$c_\alpha(x) := \begin{cases} c(x)^\alpha = b(|x|)^\alpha, & \text{if } c \in \mathcal{R}, \\ \displaystyle\int_{\Delta(x)} b(|y|)^\alpha dy, & \text{if } c \in \mathcal{I}. \end{cases} \tag{3.5}$$

In particular, $c_1 = c$.

Remark 3.3. It is easy to see that, if $b^{\alpha_0} \in \mathcal{D}_d(\mathbb{R})$ for some $\alpha_0 \in (0, 1)$, then $b^\alpha \in \mathcal{D}_d(\mathbb{R})$ for all $\alpha \in [\alpha_0, 1]$.

Remark 3.4. Clearly, $c \in \mathcal{R}$ implies $c_\alpha \in \mathcal{R}$, whereas $c \in \mathcal{I}$ implies $c_\alpha \in \mathcal{I}$.

Definition 3.5. For any $c \in \mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{M}$, $t \ge 0$, and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, we define the sets

$$\Lambda_\varepsilon^\pm(t, c) := \big\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : c(x) e^{\beta(1 \pm \varepsilon)t} \ge 1\big\}. \tag{3.6}$$

Clearly, $\Lambda_\varepsilon^-(t, c) \subset \Lambda_\varepsilon^+(t, c)$.

Remark 3.6. Note that, for any $c \in \mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{M}$ and $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$, there exists $t_{c,\varepsilon} \geq 0$, such that

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} c(x) \geq e^{-\beta(1-\varepsilon)t_{c,\varepsilon}} \geq e^{-\beta(1+\varepsilon)t_{c,\varepsilon}}.$$

Therefore, for any $t \geq t_{c,\varepsilon}$ the sets $\Lambda^{\pm}_{\varepsilon}(t,c)$ are non-empty.

Remark 3.7. For any $c \in \mathcal{R}$ constructed by some $b \in \mathcal{D}_d(\mathbb{R})$ and for any $\rho \geq 0$ such that $b(\rho) \leq 1$, we have that, for any $t \geq t^{-}_{\rho,\varepsilon}$, cf. (2.27),

$$\Lambda^{\pm}_{\varepsilon}(t,c) = \big\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : |x| \leq \eta^{\pm}_{\varepsilon}(t,b)\big\}. \tag{3.7}$$

Remark 3.8. Note that $x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Lambda^{\pm}_{\varepsilon}(t,c)$ is equivalent to $c(x) < e^{-\beta(1\pm\varepsilon)t}$. In particular,

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Lambda^{\pm}_{\varepsilon}(t,c)} c(x) = 0.$$

On the other hand, for $c \in \mathcal{R}$, we have that $\lim\limits_{|x|\to\infty} c(x) = 0$. Moreover, for $c \in \mathcal{I}$, we have, by (3.1) and (3.4),

$$\lim_{\langle x\rangle \to\infty} c(x) = \lim_{\langle x\rangle \to\infty} \int_{\Delta(x)} b(|y|)dy = 0.$$

Proposition 3.9. *Let $c^{(i)} \in \mathcal{I}$ be constructed by $b_i \in \mathcal{D}_d(\mathbb{R})$, $i = 1,2$. Suppose that there exists $\rho > 0$, such that $b_1(s) \leq b_2(s)$ for all $s \geq \rho$. Then, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\tau = \tau(\varepsilon, b_1, b_2) > 0$, such that $\Lambda^{\pm}_{\varepsilon}(t, c^{(1)}) \subset \Lambda^{\pm}_{\varepsilon}(t, c^{(2)})$ for all $t \geq \tau$.*

Proof. First, we note that, for any $c \in \mathcal{M}$, the inequality $c(x) < e^{-\beta(1\pm\varepsilon)t}$ for some big enough t, is equivalent to the existence of some $\rho_t > 0$ such that $\langle x\rangle \geq \rho_t$. Then the inequlity

$$|y| \geq \langle y\rangle \geq \langle x\rangle, \qquad y \in \Delta(x),\ x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \tag{3.8}$$

shows that $x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Lambda^{\pm}_{\varepsilon}(t,c)$ implies $|y| \geq \rho_t$, $y \in \Delta(x)$.

Next, we have to prove that $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Lambda^{\pm}_{\varepsilon}(t, c^{(2)}) \subset \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Lambda^{\pm}_{\varepsilon}(t, c^{(1)})$ for big enough t. Let $\rho_0 \geq \rho$ be such that $b_1(\rho_0) \leq b_2(\rho_0) \leq 1$. Choose $\tau > 0$ such that $t \geq \tau$ implies that $\langle x\rangle \geq \rho_0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Lambda^{\pm}_{\varepsilon}(t, c^{(2)})$. By the above, for all $y \in \Delta(x)$, we will have $|y| \geq \rho_0$, and hence $b_1(y) \leq b_2(y)$, $y \in \Delta(x)$. Thus $c^{(1)}(x) \leq c^{(2)}(x)$ and hence $x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Lambda^{\pm}_{\varepsilon}(t, c^{(1)})$. □

Remark 3.10. By (3.7), Proposition 3.9 remains evidently true for $c^{(i)} \in \mathcal{R}$, $i = 1,2$ as well.

Remark 3.11. Let $c^{(i)} \in \mathcal{R}$ be constructed by $b_i \in \mathcal{D}_d(\mathbb{R})$, $i = 1,2$, such that (2.24) holds. Then, by (3.7) and Proposition 2.31, one gets

$$\Lambda^{-}_{\varepsilon_2}(t, c^{(2)}) \subset \Lambda^{-}_{\varepsilon}(t, c^{(1)}) \subset \Lambda^{-}_{\varepsilon_1}(t, c^{(2)}) \subset \Lambda^{+}_{\varepsilon_1}(t, c^{(2)}) \subset \Lambda^{+}_{\varepsilon}(t, c^{(1)}) \subset \Lambda^{+}_{\varepsilon_2}(t, c^{(2)}),$$

if only $0 < \varepsilon_1 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_2 < 1$ and $t \geq \tau(\varepsilon, \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2) > 0$. In the sequel, we will need to extend (partially) this result for the case when $b_1 = (b_2)^{\alpha}$ for an $\alpha < 1$ which is 'close to 1'. Moreover, we will need the corresponding results for functions $c^{(i)} \in \mathcal{I}$, $i = 1,2$ as well.

Theorem 3.12. *For any $\alpha_0 \in \left(\frac{3}{4}, 1\right)$ there exists $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(\alpha_0) \in (0,1)$, such that, for any $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$, there exists $\alpha = \alpha(\varepsilon) \in (\alpha_0, 1)$ such that the following holds. For any $b \in \mathcal{D}_d(\mathbb{R})$ such that $b^{\alpha_0} \in \mathcal{D}_d(\mathbb{R})$, let $c, c_\alpha \in \mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{I}$ be constructed by b and b^α, correspondingly. Then there exists $\tau = \tau(\varepsilon, b) > 0$, such that, for any $t \geq \tau$,*

$$\Lambda^-_\varepsilon(t, c_\alpha) \subset \Lambda^-_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}(t, c), \tag{3.9}$$

$$\Lambda^+_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}(t, c_\alpha) \subset \Lambda^+_\varepsilon(t, c). \tag{3.10}$$

Remark 3.13. Here and below, we will mean that if $f, g \in \mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{I}$, then either $f, g \in \mathcal{R}$ or $f, g \in \mathcal{I}$.

Remark 3.14. For any $b \in \mathcal{D}_d(\mathbb{R})$, there exists $\rho > 0$, such that $b(\rho) \leq 1$. Then, for any $s \geq \rho$, one gets that $b(s)^\alpha \geq b(s)$. Therefore, for big enough $t > 0$, the inclusions $\Lambda^\pm_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}(t, c) \subset \Lambda^\pm_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}(t, c_\alpha)$ follow from Proposition 3.9.

Proof of Theorem 3.12. We will prove (3.10). The proof of (3.9) is fully analogous. Consider two cases separately.

1) For a $c \in \mathcal{R}$. Since $\alpha_0 \in \left(\frac{3}{4}, 1\right)$, one can define

$$\varepsilon_0 := \frac{1 - \alpha_0}{\alpha_0 - \frac{1}{2}} \in (0, 1).$$

Take an arbitrary $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$, then one easily has that

$$\alpha := \frac{1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}}{1 + \varepsilon} \in (\alpha_0, 1). \tag{3.11}$$

Take an arbitrary $b \in \mathcal{D}_d(\mathbb{R})$ such that $b^{\alpha_0} \in \mathcal{D}_d(\mathbb{R})$, and let $c \in \mathcal{R}$ be constructed by b. Prove that then there is an equality in (3.10). Indeed, by (3.7), the equality in (3.10) is just equivalent to

$$\eta^+_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}(t, b^\alpha) = \eta^+_\varepsilon(t, b), \quad t \geq \tau := t^-_{\rho,\varepsilon}.$$

To prove the latter equality, apply $\log b^\alpha = \alpha \log b$ to both its parts:

$$-\Big(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\Big)\beta t = -\alpha(1 + \varepsilon)\beta t,$$

that is equivalent to (3.11).

2) For a $c \in \mathcal{I}$. Prove the following inequality, which is equivalent to (3.11),

$$\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Lambda^+_\varepsilon(t, c) \subset \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Lambda^+_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}(t, c_\alpha), \quad t \geq \tau. \tag{3.12}$$

Recall that the inclusion $x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Lambda^+_\varepsilon(t, c)$ is equivalent to

$$c(x) = \int_{\Delta(x)} b(|y|)dy < e^{-\beta(1+\varepsilon)t}. \tag{3.13}$$

We will use Hölder's inequality to estimate $c_\alpha(x)$. It is easy to see that the function

$$f(\alpha) := \alpha - \sqrt{\alpha(1 - \alpha)} : \left(\tfrac{1}{2}, 1\right) \to (0, 1)$$

is increasing. We set $p := p(\alpha) := \frac{1}{f(\alpha)} > 1$ and $q := q(\alpha) := \frac{1}{1-f(\alpha)} > 1$. Then $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$ and, by (3.13), we have

$$\begin{aligned} c_\alpha(x) &= \int_{\Delta(x)} b(|y|)^{f(\alpha)+(\alpha-f(\alpha))} dy \\ &\le \left(\int_{\Delta(x)} b(|y|)^{f(\alpha)p} dy \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \left(\int_{\Delta(x)} b(|y|)^{(\alpha-f(\alpha))q} dy \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \\ &< e^{-\beta(1+\varepsilon)f(\alpha)t} \left(\int_{\Delta(x)} b(|y|)^{(\alpha-f(\alpha))q} dy \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

The inclusion $b^{\alpha_0} \in \mathcal{D}_d(\mathbb{R})$ means that (3.2) holds with b replaced by b^{α_0}. Therefore, to get the finiteness of the latter integral in (3.14), it is enough to have there α such that $\alpha_0 < g(\alpha) < 1$, where

$$g(\alpha) := (\alpha - f(\alpha))q(\alpha) = \frac{\sqrt{\alpha}}{\sqrt{\alpha} + \sqrt{1-\alpha}}, \quad \alpha \in \left(\tfrac{1}{2}, 1\right).$$

It is easy to see that $g : \left(\frac{1}{2}, 1\right) \to \left(\frac{1}{2}, 1\right)$ is increasing and $g(\alpha) < \alpha$, $\alpha \in \left(\frac{1}{2}, 1\right)$. Note also that $g\left(\frac{9}{10}\right) = \frac{3}{4}$. As a result, for the given $\alpha_0 \in \left(\frac{3}{4}, 1\right)$, there exists a unique $\alpha_1 \in \left(\frac{9}{10}, 1\right)$, such that $\alpha_0 = g(\alpha_1) < \alpha_1$. Hence, for any $\alpha \in (\alpha_1, 1) \subset (\alpha_0, 1)$, one gets $g(\alpha) > g(\alpha_1) = \alpha_0$, and then $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} b(|y|)^{g(\alpha)} dy < \infty$; in particular, the latter integral in (3.14) is finite.

Next, the function $h(\varepsilon) = \dfrac{1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}}{1 + \varepsilon} : (0, 1) \to \left(\frac{3}{4}, 1\right)$ is decreasing; cf. (3.11). Therefore, there exists a unique $\varepsilon_0 \in (0, 1)$, such that $h(\varepsilon_0) = \alpha_1$; then we have $h : (0, \varepsilon_0) \to (\alpha_1, 1)$. Take and fix now an arbitrary $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$. Since,

$$f : (\alpha_1, 1) \to \big(f(\alpha_1), 1\big) \subset (\alpha_1, 1) = (h(\varepsilon_0), 1)$$

is increasing (we used here that $f(\alpha) < \alpha$), there exists a unique $\alpha = \alpha(\varepsilon) \in (\alpha_1, 1)$, such that

$$f(\alpha) = h(\varepsilon) = \frac{1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}}{1 + \varepsilon}. \tag{3.15}$$

Therefore, after $\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon, \alpha$ are chosen, we take an arbitrary $b \in \mathcal{D}_d(\mathbb{R})$ such that $b^{\alpha_0} \in \mathcal{D}_d(\mathbb{R})$, and let $c \in \mathcal{I}$ be constructed by b. For this α, by the above, $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} b(|y|)^{g(\alpha)} dy < \infty$; therefore, there exists $r > 0$, such that, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\langle x \rangle > r$,

$$\int_{\Delta(x)} b(|y|)^{g(\alpha)} dy \le 1.$$

The latter inequality together with (3.15) and (3.14) implies that

$$c_\alpha(x) \le e^{-\beta(1+\frac{\varepsilon}{2})t}, \tag{3.16}$$

provided that $x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Lambda^+_\varepsilon(t, c)$ (i.e. (3.13) holds) and $\langle x \rangle > r$. In (3.13), $\langle x \rangle \to \infty$ if and only if $t \to \infty$; cf. Remark 3.8. Therefore, there exists $\tau = \tau(r) = \tau(\varepsilon, b) > 0$, such that $t \ge \tau$ in (3.13) implies $\langle x \rangle \ge r$. As a result, for any $t \ge \tau$ and any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Lambda^+_\varepsilon(t, c)$, one gets (3.16), that means that $x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Lambda^+_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}(t, c_\alpha)$; i.e. (3.12) holds. □

Corollary 3.15. *Let $b_1, b_2 \in \mathcal{D}_d(\mathbb{R})$ and $\alpha_0 \in \left(\frac{3}{4}, 1\right)$ be such that $b_i^{\alpha_0} \in \mathcal{D}_d(\mathbb{R})$, $i = 1, 2$ and (2.24) holds. Let $c^{(i)} \in \mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{I}$ be constructed by b_i, $i = 1, 2$. Then there exists $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(\alpha_0) \in (0, 1)$, such that, for any $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$, there exists $\tau = \tau(\varepsilon) > 0$, such that, for any $t \geq \tau$,*

$$\Lambda_{\varepsilon}^{-}(t, c^{(1)}) \subset \Lambda_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^{-}(t, c^{(2)}), \tag{3.17}$$

$$\Lambda_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^{+}(t, c^{(1)}) \subset \Lambda_{\varepsilon}^{+}(t, c^{(2)}). \tag{3.18}$$

Proof. Let ε_0 by given by Theorem 3.12. Take an arbitrary $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ and consider $\alpha = \alpha(\varepsilon) \in (\alpha_0, 1)$ also given by Theorem 3.12. Let $\rho_0 > 0$ be such that $b_i(\rho_0) \leq 1$, $i = 1, 2$. Set $\delta := 1 - \alpha \in (0, 1 - \alpha_0)$. By (2.24), there exists $\rho_\alpha \geq \rho_0$, such that

$$1 - \delta < \frac{-\log b_1(s)}{-\log b_2(s)} < 1 + \delta, \quad s > \rho_\alpha,$$

in particular,

$$b_1(s) < b_2(s)^\alpha, \quad s > \rho_\alpha. \tag{3.19}$$

By Remark 3.3, $b_2^\alpha \in \mathcal{D}_d(\mathbb{R})$, and hence, by (3.19) and Proposition 3.9, applying to b_1 and b_2^α, one gets

$$\Lambda_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^{+}(t, c^{(1)}) \subset \Lambda_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^{+}(t, c_\alpha^{(2)}).$$

The latter inequality together with (3.10) for $c = c^{(2)}$ imply (3.18).

Next, by (3.19), $b_3(s) := b_1(s)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} < b_2(s)$, if only $s > \rho_\alpha$. From here we have that $b_3 \in \mathcal{D}_d(\mathbb{R})$ and, moreover, by Proposition 3.9, applying to b_3 and b_2,

$$\Lambda_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^{-}(t, c^{(3)}) \subset \Lambda_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^{-}(t, c^{(2)}),$$

where $c^{(3)} \in \mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{I}$ in constructed by b_3, cf. Remark 3.13. The latter inequality together with (3.9) for $c = c^{(3)}$ imply (3.17). □

Remark 3.16. Using the same arguments as in the proof of Proposition 3.9, one can get that the statement of Corollary 3.15 remains true if both functions b_1, b_2 are tail-decreasing only, and $\int_0^\infty b_i(s) s^{d-1}\, ds < \infty$, $i = 1, 2$, cf. Definitions 2.5 and 3.1.

We will need the following analogues of long-tailed functions in $\mathbb{R}^d$.

Definition 3.17. 1) Let $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathcal{R}$ be the set of all functions $c \in \mathcal{R}$, such that $c(x) = b(|x|)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, where $b \in \mathcal{D}_d(\mathbb{R})$ is tail-log-convex and long-tailed.

2) Let $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{I}$ be the set of all functions $c \in \mathcal{I}$ of the form (3.4) with $p \in \mathcal{L}$.

The reasons for these definitions are explained by the following lemmas.

Lemma 3.18. *Let $c \in \mathcal{L}$. Then, for any $r > 0$,*

$$\lim_{|x| \to \infty} \sup_{|y| \leq r} \left| \frac{c(x + y)}{c(x)} - 1 \right| = 0. \tag{3.20}$$

Proof. Let c be constructed by a long-tailed $b \in \mathcal{D}_d(\mathbb{R})$. Take arbitrary $r > 0$ and $|x| \geq r$. Then, for any $|y| \leq r$, the monotonicity of b on $\mathbb{R}_+$ implies

$$b(|x| - r) \geq b(|x| - |y|) \geq b(|x + y|) \geq b(|x| + |y|) \geq b(|x| + r).$$

Therefore, for such values of x and y,

$$\left|\frac{c(x+y)}{c(x)} - 1\right| = \left|\frac{b(|x+y|)}{b(|x|)} - 1\right| \leq \max\left\{1 - \frac{b(|x|+r)}{b(|x|)}, \frac{b(|x|-r)}{b(|x|)} - 1\right\},$$

and hence (2.1) implies (3.20). □

Remark 3.19. Note that we have not used here (as well as in the following Lemma) that b is tail-log-convex.

Lemma 3.20. *Let $c \in \mathcal{N}$. Then*

$$\lim_{\langle x\rangle \to \infty} \frac{c(x+h)}{c(x)} = 1, \quad h \in \mathbb{R}^d_+. \tag{3.21}$$

Proof. Let c be constructed by a long-tailed $b \in \mathcal{D}_d(\mathbb{R})$. Take an arbitrary $h \in \mathbb{R}^d_+$, $h \neq 0$. Use Remark 2.2; namely, fix any $R > \langle h\rangle$, and note that, for any $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, with $y_j \in [x_j, x_j + R]$, $1 \leq j \leq d$, one has

$$\big||y| - |x|\big| \leq |y - x| \leq R\sqrt{d}.$$

Then, by (2.2), for any such y,

$$\left|\frac{b(|y|)}{b(|x|)} - 1\right| \leq \sup_{|\tau| \leq R\sqrt{d}|} \left|\frac{b(|x|+\tau)}{b(|x|)} - 1\right| \to 0, \quad |x| \to \infty.$$

Therefore, for any $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$, there exists $r = r(\varepsilon, R)$, such that, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\langle x\rangle \geq r$ (that implies $|x| \geq r$, by (3.8)), one has

$$1 - \varepsilon \leq \frac{b(|y|)}{b(|x|)} \leq 1 + \varepsilon, \quad y_j \in [x_j, x_j + R],\ 1 \leq j \leq d.$$

As a result,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - \frac{c(x+h)}{c(x)} &= \frac{\displaystyle\int_{x_1}^{x_1+h_1} \cdots \int_{x_d}^{x_d+h_d} b(|y|)\, dy}{\displaystyle\int_{x_1}^{\infty} \cdots \int_{x_d}^{\infty} b(|y|)\, dy} \leq \frac{\displaystyle\int_{x_1}^{x_1+\langle h\rangle} \cdots \int_{x_d}^{x_d+\langle h\rangle} \frac{b(|y|)}{b(|x|)}\, dy}{\displaystyle\int_{x_1}^{x_1+R} \cdots \int_{x_d}^{x_d+R} \frac{b(|y|)}{b(|x|)}\, dy} \\ &\leq \frac{1+\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon} \frac{\langle h\rangle^d}{R^d} < \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

provided that $R = R(\langle h\rangle, \varepsilon) > \langle h\rangle$ is chosen big enough. The statement is proved. □

Remark 3.21. Note that all previous results remain true if $c \in \mathcal{M}$ is defined by (3.4) with $\Delta(x)$ replaced by $\Delta(x + x_0)$ for a fixed $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

4 Domain of uniform convergence to positive constant solution

First, we check that (A6) holds for the equation (1.1) with $m \in (0, \varkappa)$ and G given by (1.9). As in [28], we suppose the following additional reinforcement of (1.14). Namely, we assume, additionally to (1.14), that there exist $\delta, \rho > 0$, such that

$$J(x) \geq \delta, \quad \text{for a.a. } x \in B_\rho(0). \tag{4.1}$$

Moreover, for simplicity, we assume also that

$$\begin{gathered} \text{there exists } R_0 > 0, \text{ such that, for all } R \geq R_0, \\ \int_{B_R(0)} xa(x)\,dx = 0. \end{gathered} \tag{4.2}$$

An evident sufficient condition, to get (4.2), is $a(-x) = a(x)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

The following reinforcement of (A6) holds

Proposition 4.1. *Fix some norm on $\mathbb{R}^d$ and denote by $B_r(x)$ the ball centered at an $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with the radius $r > 0$ w.r.t. this norm. Let assumptions* (1.14), (4.1), *and* (4.2) *hold; and let $a \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Suppose that, for some $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\mu_0 \in (0, \theta)$, $\delta_0 > 0$, the initial condition u_0 to the equation* (1.1) *with G given by* (1.9) *and $m \in (0, \varkappa)$ is such that $0 \leq u_0 \leq \theta$ and $u_0(x) \geq \mu_0$, for a.a. $x \in B_{\delta_0}(x_0)$. Then, for any $\mu \in (0, \theta)$, $r > 0$, and $x_1 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ there exists $t_\mu(r) > 0$ (which does not depend on x_1), such that $u(x,t) \geq \mu$, for a.a. $x \in B_r(x_1)$ and for all $t \geq t_\mu(r)$, where $u = u(x,t)$ is the corresponding solution to* (1.9).

In particular, (A6) *holds (where $r = 1$ and $x_1 = x_0$).*

Proof. To keep the notations from [28], we set here $a^+(x) := a(x)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and $\varkappa^+ := \varkappa$. Take an arbitrary $x_1 \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Let T_{x_1} denote the translation operator on E given by $T_{x_1} v(x) = v(x - x_1)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $v \in E$. By [28, Proposition 3.15], the solution to (1.1) with G given by (1.9) and the initial condition $T_{x_1} u_0$ is just $T_{x_1} u$. Therefore, it is enough to prove the statement for $x_1 = 0$.

For any $R > 0$, we define

$$a_R^\pm(x) = \mathbb{1}_{B_R(0)}(x) a^\pm(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d; \qquad A_R^\pm := \int_{B_R(0)} a^\pm(x)\,dx.$$

In the proof of [28, Proposition 3.18] there was shown that

$$\theta_R := \frac{\varkappa^+ A_R^+ - m}{\varkappa^- A_R^-} \leq \theta.$$

Clearly, $A_R^+ \to 1$, $\theta_R \to \theta$, as $R \to \infty$. Choose $R \geq R_0$ big enough to ensure

$$A_R^+ > \frac{m}{\varkappa^+} \in (0,1), \qquad \mu_0 \leq \theta_R.$$

Set also

$$u_0^R(x) := \mu_0 \mathbb{1}_{B_{\delta_0}(x_0)}(x) \leq u_0(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Consider the initial value problem (1.1) with G given by (1.9) for a function $u^R = u^R(x,t)$ with $a^\pm$ replaced by $a_R^\pm$ and u_0 replaced by u_0^R. Since $u_0^R \leq u_0$

and $u_0^R \le \theta_R$, we have by [28, Proposition 3.18, Remark 3.19] that, for all $t \ge 0$ and a.a. $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$0 \le u^R(x,t) \le u(x,t) \le \theta.$$

Next, it is straightforward to check that the probability densities $\frac{1}{A_R^{\pm}} a_R^{\pm}(x)$ satisfy the conditions of [28, Corollary 5.11]. Moreover, by [28, Proposition 5.7], the assumption (4.2) implies that the origin belongs to the interior of the set Υ_1 in the statement of [28, Corollary 5.11]. As a result, there exists $\tau_\mu > 0$ such that $u(x,t) \ge \mu$ for all $t \ge \tau_\mu$ and for a.a. $x \in c_R t B_1(0) = B_{c_R t}(0)$, where $c_R > 0$ is a constant dependent on a^+, R, m, cf. again [28, Proposition 5.7]. Hence, if $t \ge \max\{\tau_\mu, \frac{r}{c_R}\} =: t_\mu(r)$, one gets the desired inequality on $B_r(0) \subset B_{c_R t}(0)$, that fulfills the proof.

It is easy to see that the proof remains unchanged if we would treat $B_R(x_0)$ as the ball with the center at $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and the radius $R > 0$ with respect to any other (non Euclidean) norm on $\mathbb{R}^d$. □

Now, we return to a general G in the equation (1.1). In this Section, we will present sufficient conditions on the kernel a and the initial condition u_0 to the equation (1.1) which imply (1.15) with $\mathscr{C}_t$ given by (1.17).

Let $\beta \in (0,\infty)$ be defined by (A1). Let $c \in \mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{M}$, $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$, and $\Lambda_\varepsilon^-(t,c)$ be given by (3.6). Note that, in the notations of (1.17), $\Lambda_{(1-\varepsilon)t} := \Lambda_\varepsilon^-(t,c)$.

For any $\lambda > 0$, we define the function

$$g(x,t) = g_{c,\varepsilon,\lambda}(x,t) = \lambda \min\{1, c(x) e^{\beta_\varepsilon^- t}\} \tag{4.3}$$

$$= \lambda \mathbb{1}_{\Lambda_\varepsilon^-(t,c)}(x) + \lambda c(x) e^{\beta_\varepsilon^- t} \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Lambda_\varepsilon^-(t,c)}(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d, t \ge 0. \tag{4.4}$$

Lemma 4.2. *Let $c \in \mathcal{L}$ be given by a (long-tailed and tail-log-convex) function $b \in \mathcal{D}_d(\mathbb{R})$, and $\rho > 0$ be such that $b(\rho) \le 1$. Define, for any $\lambda > 0$, $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$,*

$$f(s,t) := \lambda \mathbb{1}_{s \le \eta_\varepsilon^-(t)} + \lambda e^{\beta_\varepsilon^- t} b(s) \mathbb{1}_{s > \eta_\varepsilon^-(t)} \in [0,\lambda], \quad s \in \mathbb{R}_+,\ t \ge t_{\rho,\varepsilon}^-, \tag{4.5}$$

i.e. $g(x,t) = f(|x|,t)$, where g is given by (4.4). Then, for any $\tau > 0$,

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \sup_{s \in \mathbb{R}_+} \left| \frac{f(s+\tau,t)}{f(s,t)} - 1 \right| = 0. \tag{4.6}$$

Proof. Take an arbitrary $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$. For an arbitrary fixed $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_+$, choose $t_0 \ge t_{\rho,\varepsilon}^-$, such that $\eta_\varepsilon^-(t_0) \ge \tau$. Then, for any $t \ge t_0$, the function $F_{\tau,t}(s) := \frac{f(s+\tau,t)}{f(s,t)}$ takes the following values. For $0 \le s \le \eta_\varepsilon^-(t) - \tau$, one has $F_{\tau,t}(s) = 1$. For $\eta_\varepsilon^-(t) - \tau < s \le \eta_\varepsilon^-(t)$, we have $F_{\tau,t}(s) = e^{\beta_\varepsilon^- t} b(s+\tau)$ and, since b is decreasing on $[\eta_\varepsilon^-(t), \infty)$, one gets

$$\frac{b(\eta_\varepsilon^-(t)+\tau)}{b(\eta_\varepsilon^-(t))} = e^{\beta_\varepsilon^- t} b(\eta_\varepsilon^-(t)+\tau) \le e^{\beta_\varepsilon^- t} b(s+\tau) \le e^{\beta_\varepsilon^- t} b(\eta_\varepsilon^-(t)) = 1.$$

Finally, for $s > \eta_\varepsilon^-(t)$, we have, $F_{\tau,t}(s) = \frac{b(s+\tau)}{b(s)} \le 1$ (since b is decreasing) and, by Lemma 2.9,

$$\frac{b(s+\tau)}{b(s)} \ge \frac{b(\eta_\varepsilon^-(t)+\tau)}{b(\eta_\varepsilon^-(t))}.$$

As a result, for all $s \in \mathbb{R}_+$,

$$0 \le 1 - F_{\tau,t}(s) \le \mathbb{1}_{\{s > \eta_\varepsilon^-(t) - \tau\}}(s)\left(1 - \frac{b(\eta_\varepsilon^-(t)+\tau)}{b(\eta_\varepsilon^-(t))}\right), \tag{4.7}$$

that implies the statement because of (2.1). □

Lemma 4.3. *Let $c \in \mathcal{N}$ and g be given by (4.4). Then, for any $h \in \mathbb{R}^d_+$,*

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d} \left| \frac{g(x+h,t)}{g(x,t)} - 1 \right| = 0. \tag{4.8}$$

Proof. Take an arbitrary $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $h \in \mathbb{R}^d_+$. By the monotonicity of functions (3.3), we have $c(x+h) \le c(x)$. Next, it is easy to see that $x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Lambda_\varepsilon^-(t,c)$ implies $x + h \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Lambda_\varepsilon^-(t,c)$, and hence

$$\frac{g(x+h,t)}{g(x,t)} = \frac{c(x+h)}{c(x)} \le 1.$$

Let $x \in \Lambda_\varepsilon^-(t,c)$. If $x + h \in \Lambda_\varepsilon^-(t,c)$, then $\frac{g(x+h,t)}{g(x,t)} = 1$. Let now h be such that $x + h \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Lambda_\varepsilon^-(t,c)$. Then

$$\frac{g(x+h,t)}{g(x,t)} = e^{\beta_\varepsilon^- t} c(x+h) \le 1.$$

Moreover, since $x \in \Lambda_\varepsilon^-(t,c)$ implies $c(x)e^{\beta_\varepsilon^- t} \ge 1$, one has for such x, h the following estimate

$$0 \le 1 - \frac{g(x+h,t)}{g(x,t)} \le 1 - \frac{c(x+h)}{c(x)}.$$

As a result,

$$\left| \frac{g(x+h,t)}{g(x,t)} - 1 \right| = 1 - \frac{g(x+h,t)}{g(x,t)} \le \sup_{y: c(y+h) < e^{-\beta_\varepsilon^- t}} \left(1 - \frac{c(y+h)}{c(y)}\right).$$

Because of (3.21), for the chosen $h \in \mathbb{R}^d_+$ and for an arbitrary $\delta > 0$, there exists $\rho = \rho(\delta, h) > 0$, such that $\sup\limits_{1\le j\le d} y_j > \rho$ implies

$$0 \le 1 - \frac{c(y+h)}{c(y)} \le \delta.$$

Choose now $t_0 = t_0(\rho, \varepsilon, h) = t_0(\delta, \varepsilon, h)$, such that $c\big((\rho, \dots, \rho) + h\big) > e^{-\beta_\varepsilon^- t_0}$. Prove that then, for any $t \ge t_0$, the inequality $c(y+h) \le e^{-\beta_\varepsilon^- t}$ implies $\sup\limits_{1\le j\le d} y_j > \rho$. Indeed, on the contrary, suppose that, for some $t \ge t_0$, the inequality $c(y+h) \le e^{-\beta_\varepsilon^- t}$ holds, however, $\sup\limits_{1\le j\le d} y_j \le \rho$. The latter yields

$$e^{-\beta_\varepsilon^- t} \ge c(y+h) \ge c\big((\rho, \dots, \rho) + h\big) > e^{-\beta_\varepsilon^- t_0},$$

that contradicts to that $t \ge t_0$. As a result, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $t > t_0$,

$$\left| \frac{g(x+h,t)}{g(x,t)} - 1 \right| \le \sup_{y:\ \sup\limits_{1\le j\le d} y_j > \rho} \left(1 - \frac{c(y+h)}{c(y)}\right) < \delta,$$

that implies the statement. □

Definition 4.4. Let (A1) hold. A function $v : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$ is said to be a *sub-solution* to (1.19) on $[\tau, \infty)$ for some $\tau \geq 0$, if, cf. (1.12),

$$(\mathcal{F}_m v)(x,t) := \frac{\partial}{\partial t} v(x,t) - \varkappa (a * v)(x,t) + m v(x,t) \leq 0 \tag{4.9}$$

for a.a. $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and for all $t \in [\tau, \infty)$.

Proposition 4.5. *Let* (A1) *hold and* $c \in \mathcal{L} \cup \mathcal{N}$. *Then, for any* $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ *and for any* $\lambda > 0$, *there exists* $\tau_0 = \tau_0(\varepsilon) > 0$, *such that the function* $g = g(x,t)$, *given by* (4.4), *is a sub-solution to* (1.19) *on* $[\tau_0, \infty)$.

Proof. Take an arbitrary $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$. One has

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} g(x,t) &= \lambda \beta_\varepsilon^- e^{\beta_\varepsilon^- t} b(|x|) \mathbb{1}_{|x| > \eta_\varepsilon^-(t)} \\ &= \beta(1-\varepsilon) g(x,t) \mathbb{1}_{|x| > \eta_\varepsilon^-(t)} \leq \beta(1-\varepsilon) g(x,t). \end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

Therefore, by (4.9), (4.10),

$$-(\mathcal{F}_m g) \geq \varkappa a * g - m g - \beta(1-\varepsilon) g = \varkappa a * g - \varkappa g + \beta \varepsilon g. \tag{4.11}$$

To find now an appropriate bound from below for $Lg = \varkappa a * g - \varkappa g$, cf. (1.6), consider two cases separately.

1. Let $c \in \mathcal{L}$, $c(x) = b(|x|)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Let $\rho \geq 0$ be such that $b(\rho) \leq 1$, and $t_{\rho,\varepsilon}^-$ and $\eta_\varepsilon^-(t) = \eta_\varepsilon^-(t,b)$ be given by (2.27) and (2.30), correspondingly. Let $\lambda \in [0, \lambda_0]$. Since f given by (4.5) is decreasing in its first coordinate, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varkappa (a * g)(x,t) &= \varkappa \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} a(-y) g(x+y,t) dy = \varkappa \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} a(-y) f(|x+y|,t) dy \\ &\geq \varkappa \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} a(-y) f(|x|+|y|,t) dy = \varkappa \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} a(y) f(|x|+|y|,t) dy \\ &= \varkappa g(x,t) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} a(y) \frac{f(|x|+|y|,t)}{f(|x|,t)} dy, \end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

for a.a. $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Note that, by (4.7),

$$0 < \frac{f(|x|+|y|,t)}{f(|x|,t)} \leq 1, \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d, \ t \in \mathbb{R}_+. \tag{4.13}$$

By (4.12), (4.13), (1.2), we have, cf. (4.11),

$$\varkappa (a * g)(x,t) - \varkappa g(x,t) \geq -\varkappa g(x,t) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} a(y) \left| \frac{f(|x|+|y|,t)}{f(|x|,t)} - 1 \right| dy \tag{4.14}$$

Next, by (4.6), (4.13), and the dominated convergence theorem, one gets

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} a(y) \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \left| \frac{f(|x|+|y|,t)}{f(|x|,t)} - 1 \right| dy = 0. \tag{4.15}$$

Therefore, for any $\delta \in (0,1)$ (small enough later), there exists a $\tau_0 \geq t_{\rho,\varepsilon}^-$, such that, for all $t \geq \tau_0$ and for a.a. $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\varkappa (a * g)(x,t) - \varkappa g(x,t) \geq -\varkappa \delta g(x,t).$$

As a result, by (4.11),

$$-\mathcal{F}_m g \geq -\varkappa\delta g + \beta\varepsilon g \geq 0, \tag{4.16}$$

if only $\delta < \dfrac{\beta\varepsilon}{\varkappa}$. The proof, for $c \in \mathcal{R}$, is fulfilled.

2. Let $c \in \mathcal{N}$. Denote, for any $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$y^+ := \big(|y_1|, \dots, |y_d|\big) \in \mathbb{R}^d_+.$$

Since the function c is decreasing along all basis directions (i.e. the functions (3.3) are all decreasing, $j = 1, \dots, d$), we easily get that the function g given by (4.4) has the same property (in x). Therefore, since $y_j \leq y_j^+$, $j = 1, \dots, d$, one gets

$$g(x + y, t) \geq g(x + y^+, t).$$

Therefore, we will have, instead of (4.12),

$$\begin{aligned}\varkappa(a * g)(x,t) &= \varkappa \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} a(-y) g(x+y,t)\, dy \geq \varkappa \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} a(-y) g(x+y^+,t)\, dy \\ &= \varkappa g(x,t) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} a(y) \left(\frac{g(x+y^+,t)}{g(x,t)} - 1 \right) dy + \varkappa g(x,t) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} a(y)\, dy\end{aligned}$$

Taking into account (4.8) for $h = y^+$, the rest of the proof is fully analogous to the first part. □

Definition 4.6. A function $w : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$ is said to be a *sub-solution* to (1.1) on $[\tau, \infty)$ for some $\tau \geq 0$, if $(\mathcal{F}w)(x,t) \leq 0$ for a.a. $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and for all $t \in [\tau, \infty)$, where $\mathcal{F}$ is given by (1.12).

The proof of the following statement is straightforward.

Proposition 4.7. *Let* (A1)–(A5) *hold. Let* $0 \leq u \leq \theta$ *be a solution to* (1.1), *and* $w : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$ *be a sub-solution to* (1.1) *on* $[\tau, \infty)$ *for some* $\tau \geq 0$. *Suppose that, for some* $t_0, t_1 \geq \tau$, *we have* $u(x, t_0) \geq w(x, t_1)$ *for a.a.* $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. *Then, for all* $t \geq 0$,

$$u(x, t + t_0) \geq w(x, t + t_1), \quad \text{for a.a. } x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

We are going to find now, using (A3) and Proposition 4.5, sufficient conditions to have (4.4) as a sub-solution to (1.1) as well.

Proposition 4.8. *Let* (A1)–(A5) *hold and* $c \in \mathcal{L} \cup \mathcal{N}$. *Then, for any* $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$, *there exist* $\lambda_0 = \lambda_0(\varepsilon) > 0$ *and* $\tau_0 = \tau_0(\varepsilon) > 0$, *such that, for any* $\lambda \in [0, \lambda_0]$, *the function* $g = g(x,t)$, *given by* (4.4), *is a sub-solution to* (1.1) *on* $[\tau_0, \infty)$.

Proof. Take an arbitrary $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$. For any $\delta \in (0, \varepsilon\beta)$, one has that $m + \delta < m + \beta = \varkappa$; hence one can apply Proposition 4.5 to the equation (1.19) with m replaced by $m + \delta$. More precisely, we choose $\varepsilon_1 \in (0,1)$ to ensure that

$$(\varkappa - (m + \delta))(1 - \varepsilon_1) = (\varkappa - m)(1 - \varepsilon), \tag{4.17}$$

namely, $\varepsilon_1 := \dfrac{\beta\varepsilon - \delta}{\beta - \delta}$. Then, by (4.17) and Proposition 4.5, there exists $\tau_0 = \tau_0(\varepsilon_1) = \tau_0(\varepsilon)$, such that

$$-\mathcal{F}_{m+\delta} g(x,t) \geq 0, \quad t \geq \tau_0, \tag{4.18}$$

where $\mathcal{F}_{m+\delta}$ and g are given by (4.9) and (4.3), correspondingly.

Next, by (A1)–(A3), there exists $\lambda_0 = \lambda_0(\delta) = \lambda_0(\varepsilon) > 0$, such that $0 \le v \le \lambda_0$, $v \in E$, implies

$$0 \le Gv < \delta. \tag{4.19}$$

Clearly, (4.3) yields that $0 \le g(x,t) \le \lambda$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Then, by (1.12), (4.9), (4.18), (4.19) we have, for any $\lambda \in [0, \lambda_0]$ and for any $t \ge \tau_0$,

$$-\mathcal{F}g = -\mathcal{F}_m g - gGg = -\mathcal{F}_{m+\delta} g + \delta g - gGg \ge 0.$$

The statement is proved. □

Theorem 4.9. *Let the assumptions* (A1)–(A6) *hold. Let* $0 \le u_0 \le \theta$ *be such that there exist* $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\mu_0 \in (0, \theta)$, $\delta_0 > 0$, *such that* $u_0(x) \ge \mu_0$ *for a.a.* $x \in B_{\delta_0}(0)$. *Suppose also that there exists* $c \in \mathcal{L} \cup \mathcal{N}$, *such that*

$$(a * u_0)(x) \ge c(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{4.20}$$

Let $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ *and let* $\Lambda_\varepsilon^-(t,c)$ *be given by* (3.6). *Then*

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \operatorname*{ess\,inf}_{x \in \Lambda_\varepsilon^-(t,c)} u(x,t) = \theta. \tag{4.21}$$

Proof. Recall that, by (A1)–(A5), $0 \le u_0 \le \theta$ implies (1.13); and then, by (A3), $Gu \le \beta$. Rewrite (1.1) in the form (1.3) with F given by (1.4), then, by (1.5), $Fu \ge 0$. Therefore, for all $t > 0$ and a.a. $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned} u(x,t) &= e^{-\varkappa t} u_0(x) + \varkappa \int_0^t e^{-\varkappa(t-s)} (a * u)(x,s) ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t e^{-\varkappa(t-s)} (Fu)(x,s) ds \\ &\ge e^{-\varkappa t} u_0(x) + \varkappa \int_0^t e^{-\varkappa(t-s)} (a * u)(x,s) ds. \end{aligned}$$

The same inequality for $u(x,s)$ implies

$$\begin{aligned} u(x,t) &\ge \varkappa \int_0^t e^{-\varkappa(t-s)} (a * u)(x,s) ds \\ &\ge \varkappa \int_0^t e^{-\varkappa(t-s)} e^{-\varkappa s} (a * u_0)(x) ds \\ &= \varkappa t e^{-\varkappa t} (a * u_0)(x) \ge \varkappa t e^{-\varkappa t} c(x), \end{aligned} \tag{4.22}$$

for all $t \ge 0$ and a.a. $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, because of (4.20).

Fix an arbitrary $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$. Take any $\delta \in (0, \varepsilon)$ and consider $\lambda_0 = \lambda_0(\delta) > 0$ and $\tau_0 = \tau_0(\delta) > 0$, both given by Proposition 4.8. Set now

$$\lambda := \min\{\lambda_0, \varkappa \tau_0 e^{-(\varkappa + \beta_\delta^-)\tau_0}\}.$$

Then, by (4.22) and (4.3), we have, for a.a. $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$u(x, \tau_0) \ge \lambda e^{\beta_\delta^- \tau_0} c(x) \ge \lambda \min\{e^{\beta_\delta^- \tau_0} c(x), 1\} = g_{c,\delta,\lambda}(x, \tau_0).$$

Therefore, by Propositions 4.8 and 4.7, one gets, for any $\tau \geq 0$,

$$u(x, \tau_0 + \tau) \geq g_{c,\delta,\lambda}(x, \tau_0 + \tau), \quad \text{for a.a. } x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{4.23}$$

As a result,

$$u(x, \tau_0 + \tau) \geq \lambda, \quad \text{for a.a. } x \in \Lambda_\delta^-(\tau_0 + \tau, c), \tau \geq 0. \tag{4.24}$$

From now we will distinguish two cases.

1. Let $c \in \mathcal{L}$, $c(x) = b(|x|)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Fix $\tau \geq 0$. Since (3.7) holds, we have that the set

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\Lambda} :&= \{y \in \mathbb{R}^d : B_1(y) \subset \Lambda_\delta^-(\tau_0 + \tau, c)\} \\ &= \left\{y \in \mathbb{R}^d : B_1(y) \subset B_{\eta_\delta^-(\tau_0+\tau,b)}(0)\right\} \end{aligned}$$

is nothing but $B_{\eta_\delta^-(\tau_0+\tau,b)-1}(0)$ and, moreover,

$$\Lambda_\delta^-(\tau_0 + \tau, c) = \bigcup_{y \in \widetilde{\Lambda}} B_1(y). \tag{4.25}$$

Take and fix now an arbitrary $y \in \widetilde{\Lambda}$, i.e. $|y| \leq \eta_\delta^-(\tau_0 + \tau) - 1$. Then, by (4.24),

$$u(x, \tau_0 + \tau) \geq \lambda \mathbb{1}_{B_1(y)}(x), \quad \text{for a.a. } x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Consider now equation (1.1) with the initial condition $v_0(x) = u(x, \tau_0 + \tau)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$; let $v(x,t)$ be the corresponding solution to (1.1). By the uniqueness in (A5), $v(x,t) = u(x, \tau_0 + \tau + t)$, $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$.

Take an arbitrary $\mu \in (0, \theta)$. Apply the assumption (A6) to the solution v with $x_0 = y$, $\delta_0 = 1$, $\mu_0 = \lambda$; then there exists $t_\mu \geq 1$, such that $v(x,t) \geq \mu$, for a.a. $x \in B_1(y)$. As a result,

$$u(x, \tau_0 + t_\mu + \tau) \geq \mu, \tag{4.26}$$

for all $\tau \geq 0$ and a.a. $x \in B_1(y)$. Stress that t_μ does not depend on a y with $|y| \leq \eta_\delta^-(\tau_0 + \tau) - 1$. As a result, by (4.25) for any $\delta \in (0,1)$ and $\mu \in (0, \theta)$, there exist $\lambda_0 = \lambda_0(\delta) > 0$, $\tau_0 = \tau_0(\delta) > 0$, and $t_\mu \geq 1$, such that, for all $\tau \geq 0$ and for a.a. x with $|x| \leq \eta_\delta^-(\tau_0 + \tau)$, the inequality (4.26) holds.

Apply now Lemma 2.29 for $\varepsilon_2 := \varepsilon > \delta =: \varepsilon_1$, $t_1 = \tau_0$, $t_2 = \tau_0 + t_\mu$. One gets that there exists $\tau_1 \geq 0$, such that, for all $\tau \geq \tau_1$,

$$\eta_\varepsilon^-(\tau + \tau_0 + t_\mu) \leq \eta_\delta^-(\tau + \tau_0),$$

i.e. (4.26) holds for all $\tau \geq \tau_1$ and a.a. x with $|x| \leq \eta_\varepsilon^-(\tau + \tau_0 + t_\mu)$. Since $\mu \in (0, \theta)$ was arbitrary, the latter fact yields (4.21).

2. Let now $c \in \mathcal{N}$. Use the assumption (A6) for the norm in $\mathbb{R}^d$ given by

$$|x|_\infty := |(x_1, \dots, x_d)|_\infty := \max_{1 \leq j \leq d} |x_j|.$$

Let $\widetilde{B}_{\frac{1}{2}}(x)$ denote the ball with the center at an $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and the radius $\frac{1}{2}$ w.r.t. the $|\cdot|_\infty$-norm. Then, clearly,

$$\widetilde{B}_{\frac{1}{2}}(x) = \bigtimes_{j=1}^d \left[x_j - \frac{1}{2}, x_j + \frac{1}{2}\right] = \bigtimes_{j=1}^d \left[y_j - 1, y_j\right] =: C_1(y),$$

where $y_j = x_j + \frac{1}{2}$, $1 \le j \le d$. Stress that, by (3.6), if $c \in \mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$, i.e. the functions (3.3) are decreasing on $\mathbb{R}$, then $y \in \Lambda_\delta^-(\tau_0 + \tau, c)$ implies that

$$C_1(y) \subset \Lambda_\delta^-(\tau_0 + \tau, c).$$

Therefore, cf. (4.25),

$$\Lambda_\delta^-(\tau_0 + \tau, c) = \bigcup_{y \in \Lambda_\delta^-(\tau_0+\tau,c)} C_1(y).$$

Hence, one can just repeat the previous proof by changing $B_1(y)$ on $C_1(y)$, $y \in \Lambda_\delta^-(\tau_0 + \tau, c)$ and using the assumption (A6). □

The following proposition gives a sufficient condition for (4.20); the result is a generalisation of [30, Theorem 4.2].

Proposition 4.10. *Let $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}_+)$ and $c : \mathbb{R}^d \to (0, \infty)$ be a bounded function, such that* (3.20) *holds (e.g. $c \in \mathcal{L}$). Then*

$$\liminf_{|x|\to\infty} \frac{(c * f)(x)}{c(x)} \ge \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(y)\, dy. \tag{4.27}$$

Moreover, there exists $D > 0$ such that

$$(c * f)(x) \ge Dc(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Proof. For any $r > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{(c * f)(x)}{c(x)} &\ge \int_{|y|\le r} \frac{c(x-y)}{c(x)} f(y)\, dy \\ &\ge \left(1 - \sup_{|y|\le r} \Big| \frac{c(x-y)}{c(x)} - 1 \Big| \right) \int_{|y|\le r} f(y)\, dy.\end{aligned}$$

Take an arbitrary $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and choose $r = r(\delta) > 0$ such that $\int_{|y|\le r} f(y)\, dy > (1 - \delta) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(y)\, dy$. Next, by (3.20), there exists $\rho = \rho(r) = \rho(\delta) \ge r$, such that $\sup\limits_{|y|\le r} \big| \frac{c(x-y)}{c(x)} - 1 \big| < \delta$, for all $|x| \ge \rho$. As a result, for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, there exists $\rho = \rho(\delta) > 0$, such that

$$\frac{(c * f)(x)}{c(x)} > (1 - \delta)^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(y)\, dy, \quad |x| \ge \rho,$$

that yields (4.27). Finally, by e.g. [28, Lemma 2.1], $c * f$ is a continuous function on $B_\rho(0)$; then, it is easy to see that $c(x) > 0$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ implies that $(c * f)(x) > 0$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Hence the boundedness of c yields $\inf\limits_{|x|\le\rho} \frac{(c*f)(x)}{c(x)} > 0$, that fulfilled the statement. □

The use of Theorem 4.9 and Proposition 4.10 under different relations between a and u_0 is presented in Section 6.

5 Domain of uniform convergence to zero

Our aim for this Section is to get a counterpart to Theorem 4.9, namely, we are going to find sufficient conditions on a function $c \in \mathcal{L} \cup \mathcal{N}$ to have, for a solution u to the equation (1.1), that

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{x\notin\Lambda^+_\varepsilon(t,c)} u(x,t) = 0, \tag{5.1}$$

where ε is small enough and $\mathcal{L}a_\varepsilon(t,c)$ is given by (3.6). Note that, by (3.6), if $c_1, c_2 \in \mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{M}$ are such that $c_1(x) \le c_2(x)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, then $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Lambda^+_\varepsilon(t,c_2) \subset \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Lambda^+_\varepsilon(t,c_1)$, therefore, we are interested to get (5.1) for the 'smallest possible' c, the best is to get it for the same c as in Theorem 4.9.

Because of the inequality (1.20), which requires (A1), (A2) and (A5) only, it is enough to show (5.1) for u replaced by w; recall that the latter function is the solution to (1.19).

For a function $\widetilde{\omega} : \mathbb{R}^d \to (0,+\infty)$, we define, for any $f : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$,

$$\|f\|_{\widetilde{\omega}} := \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|f(x)|}{\widetilde{\omega}(x)} \in [0,\infty]. \tag{5.2}$$

If $\widetilde{\omega}(x) = b(|x|)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, for a function $b : \mathbb{R}_+ \to (0,\infty)$, we will use the notation $\|f\|_b := \|f\|_{\widetilde{\omega}}$.

Proposition 5.1 (cf. [28, Propostion 5.2])**.** *Let a function $\widetilde{\omega} : \mathbb{R}^d \to (0,+\infty)$ be such that $a * \widetilde{\omega}$ is well-defined (for example, let $\widetilde{\omega}$ be bounded) and, for some $\gamma \in (0,\infty)$,*

$$\frac{(a*\widetilde{\omega})(x)}{\widetilde{\omega}(x)} \le \gamma, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{5.3}$$

Let $0 \le u_0 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\|u_0\|_{\widetilde{\omega}} < \infty$; let w be the corresponding solution to (1.19)*. Then*

$$\|w(\cdot,t)\|_{\widetilde{\omega}} \le \|u_0\|_{\widetilde{\omega}} e^{(\varkappa(\gamma-1)+\beta)t}, \quad t \ge 0. \tag{5.4}$$

Proof. For any $f : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$, with $\|f\|_{\widetilde{\omega}} < \infty$, we have

$$\left|\frac{(a*f)(x)}{\widetilde{\omega}(x)}\right| \le \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{a(y)\widetilde{\omega}(x-y)}{\widetilde{\omega}(x)} \frac{|f(x-y)|}{\widetilde{\omega}(x-y)} dy \le \frac{a*\widetilde{\omega}(x)}{\widetilde{\omega}(x)} \|f\|_{\widetilde{\omega}}. \tag{5.5}$$

The solution w to the linear equation (1.19) with a bounded, in E operator in the r.h.s., exists and is unique on the whole $\mathbb{R}_+$. Therefore, for any $0 \le \tau < \Upsilon$, we have that

$$w(x,t) = (\Phi_\tau w)(x,t), \quad t \in [\tau,\Upsilon],$$

where, for any $t \in [\tau,\Upsilon]$,

$$(\Phi_\tau v)(x,t) := e^{-\varkappa(t-\tau)} u_\tau(x) + \int_\tau^t e^{-\varkappa(t-s)} \big(\varkappa(a*v)(x,s) + \beta v(x,s)\big)\, ds.$$

Let $\|v\|_{\tau,\Upsilon} := \sup_{t\in[\tau,\Upsilon]} \|v(\cdot,t)\|$, where the latter norm is the norm in E. Then, one easily gets, that $\|\Phi_\tau v\|_{\tau,\Upsilon} < \infty$ and

$$\|\Phi_\tau v_1 - \Phi_\tau v_2\|_{\tau,\Upsilon} \le (\varkappa+\beta)\|v_1 - v_2\|_{\tau,\Upsilon}(\Upsilon - \tau).$$

Therefore, Φ_τ is contraction mapping on the set of such v, provided that $\Upsilon - \tau < \frac{1}{\varkappa+\beta}$. Fixing any $\delta \in \big(0, \frac{1}{\varkappa+\beta}\big)$, one gets that w is the limit of $(\Phi_\tau)^n v$, $n \to \infty$, for any v, on time intervals $[0,\delta]$, $[\delta, 2\delta]$, and so on.

Suppose that, for some $\tau = (N-1)\delta$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$, that $\|u_\tau\|_{\widetilde{\omega}} \le \|u_0\|_{\widetilde{\omega}} e^{pt}$, for

$$p := \varkappa(\gamma - 1) + \beta. \tag{5.6}$$

Take any $0 \le v(\cdot,t) \in E$, $t \in [\tau, \Upsilon]$, $\Upsilon := \tau + \delta$, such that

$$\|v(\cdot,t)\|_{\widetilde{\omega}} \le \|u_0\|_{\widetilde{\omega}} e^{pt}, \quad t \in [\tau, \Upsilon]. \tag{5.7}$$

We will check the following inequality

$$\|(\Phi_\tau v)(\cdot,t)\|_{\widetilde{\omega}} \le \|u_0\|_{\widetilde{\omega}} e^{pt}, \quad t \in [\tau, \Upsilon].$$

By (5.5)–(5.7), one gets, for $t \in [\tau, \Upsilon]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\le \frac{(\Phi_\tau v)(x,t)}{\widetilde{\omega}(x)} \\
&\le e^{-\varkappa(t-\tau)} \frac{u_\tau(x)}{\widetilde{\omega}(x)} + \varkappa \int_\tau^t e^{-\varkappa(t-s)} \frac{(a * v)(x,s)}{\widetilde{\omega}(x)} ds + \beta \int_\tau^t e^{-\varkappa(t-s)} \frac{v(x,s)}{\widetilde{\omega}(x)} ds \\
&\le \|u_0\|_{\widetilde{\omega}} e^{-\varkappa(t-\tau)} e^{p\tau} + \|u_0\|_{\widetilde{\omega}} \left(\varkappa \frac{(a * \widetilde{\omega})(x)}{\widetilde{\omega}(x)} + \beta \right) \int_\tau^t e^{-\varkappa(t-s)} e^{ps} ds \\
&= \|u_0\|_{\widetilde{\omega}} e^{-\varkappa t} e^{(p+\varkappa)\tau} + \frac{\varkappa\gamma + \beta}{p + \varkappa} \|u_0\|_{\widetilde{\omega}} e^{-\varkappa t} \big(e^{(p+\varkappa)t} - e^{(p+\varkappa)\tau} \big) \\
&= \|u_0\|_{\widetilde{\omega}} e^{pt}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since w is the limiting function for the sequence $\Phi_\tau^n v$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, one gets the statement. □

Proposition 5.2. *Let a function $\omega : \mathbb{R}^d \to (0, +\infty)$ be such that, for any $\lambda > 0$, the set*

$$\Omega_\lambda := \Omega_\lambda(\omega) := \big\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \omega(x) < \lambda \big\} \ne \emptyset, \tag{5.8}$$

whereas

$$\Omega_\lambda \searrow \emptyset, \quad \lambda \searrow 0 \tag{5.9}$$

(i.e., in particular, $\Omega_\lambda \subset \Omega_{\lambda'}$ for $\lambda < \lambda'$). Suppose further that there exists $\eta > 0$, such that

$$\lim_{\lambda \to 0+} \sup_{x \in \Omega_\lambda} \frac{(a * \omega)(x)}{\omega(x)} = \eta. \tag{5.10}$$

Then, for any $\delta \in (0,1)$, there exists $\lambda = \lambda(\delta, \omega) \in (0,1)$, such that (5.3) holds, with

$$\widetilde{\omega}(x) := \omega_\lambda(x) := \min\big\{ \lambda, \omega(x) \big\}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \tag{5.11}$$

and $\gamma := \max\{1, (1+\delta)\eta\}$.

Proof. By (5.11), for an arbitrary $\lambda > 0$, we have $\omega_\lambda(x) \le \lambda$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$; then $(a * \omega_\lambda)(x) \le \lambda$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, as well. In particular, cf. (5.11),

$$(a * \omega_\lambda)(x) \le \omega_\lambda(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Omega_\lambda. \tag{5.12}$$

Next, by (5.10), for any $\delta > 0$ there exists $\lambda = \lambda(\delta) \in (0,1)$ such that

$$\left| \sup_{x \in \Omega_\lambda} \frac{(a * \omega)(x)}{\omega(x)} - \eta \right| \le \delta\eta,$$

in particular,

$$(a * \omega)(x) \le (1+\delta)\eta\omega(x) = (1+\delta)\eta\omega_\lambda(x), \quad x \in \Omega_\lambda. \tag{5.13}$$

Therefore, for all $x \in \Omega_\lambda$,

$$(a * \omega_\lambda)(x) = (a * \omega)(x) - (a * (\omega - \omega_\lambda))(x) \le (1+\delta)\eta\omega_\lambda(x), \tag{5.14}$$

where we used the obvious inequality: $\omega \ge \omega_\lambda$. By (5.12) and (5.14), one gets the statement. □

Remark 5.3. It is easy to check that any function $\omega \in \mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{M}$ satisfies (5.8)–(5.9).

Theorem 5.4. *Let a function $\omega : \mathbb{R}^d \to (0, +\infty)$ be such that* (5.8)–(5.9) *hold (for example, $\omega \in \mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{M}$) and, cf.* (5.10),

$$\lim_{\lambda \to 0+} \sup_{x \in \Omega_\lambda} \frac{(a * \omega)(x)}{\omega(x)} \le 1. \tag{5.15}$$

Let $0 \le u_0 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be such that $\|u_0\|_\omega < \infty$, cf. (5.2), *and let $w = w(x,t)$ be the corresponding solution to* (1.19). *Then, for any $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$, there exist $A_\varepsilon > 0$ and $t_0 = t_0(\varepsilon) > 0$, such that, cf.* (3.6),

$$\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{x \notin \Lambda_\varepsilon^+(t,\omega)} w(x,t) \le \big(A_\varepsilon + \|u_0\|_\omega\big) e^{-\frac{\varepsilon\beta}{2}t}, \quad t \ge t_0. \tag{5.16}$$

Proof. Take an arbitrary $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ and let $\delta = \delta(\varepsilon) \in (0,1)$ be chosen later. By Remark 5.3 and Proposition 5.2, there exists $\lambda = \lambda(\delta, \omega) = \lambda(\varepsilon, \omega) \in (0,1)$, such that (5.3) holds, with $\widetilde{\omega}$ given by (5.11) and $\gamma = 1+\delta$. Set $\|u_0\|_\infty := \|u_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)}$. Note that

$$\frac{u_0(x)}{\omega_\lambda(x)} \le \frac{\theta}{\lambda} \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Omega_\lambda}(x) + \frac{u_0(x)}{\omega(x)} \mathbb{1}_{\Omega_\lambda}(x) \le \frac{\|u_0\|_\infty}{\lambda} + \|u_0\|_\omega < \infty, \tag{5.17}$$

and one can apply Proposition 5.1. Namely, setting $A_\varepsilon := \frac{\|u_0\|_\infty}{\lambda} > 0$, one gets from (5.17), (5.4) that, for a.a. $x \in \Omega_\lambda$ and for all $t \ge 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} w(x,t) &\le \|u_0\|_{\omega_\lambda} e^{(\varkappa\delta+\beta)t} \omega_\lambda(x) \\ &\le \big(A_\varepsilon + \|u_0\|_\omega\big) e^{(\varkappa\delta+\beta)t} \omega(x). \end{aligned} \tag{5.18}$$

By (3.6) and (5.8),

$$\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Lambda_\varepsilon^+(t,\omega) = \Omega_{e^{-\beta_\varepsilon^+ t}}, \quad t > 0. \tag{5.19}$$

Set $t_0 = t_0(\varepsilon) := -\frac{1}{\beta_\varepsilon^+}\log\lambda > 0$. By (5.9), one gets from (5.19) that, for any $t \geq t_0$,

$$\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Lambda_\varepsilon^+(t,\omega) \subset \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Lambda_\varepsilon^+(t_0,\omega) = \Omega_\lambda.$$

Hence, by (5.18), (5.19), for a.a. $x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Lambda_\varepsilon^+(t,\omega)$, one gets

$$\begin{aligned} w(x,t) &\leq \big(A_\varepsilon + \|u_0\|_\omega\big)e^{(\varkappa\delta+\beta)t}\omega(x) \\ &\leq \big(A_\varepsilon + \|u_0\|_\omega\big)e^{(\varkappa\delta+\beta)t}e^{-\beta_\varepsilon^+ t}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\varkappa\delta + \beta - \beta_\varepsilon^+ = \varkappa\delta + \beta - \beta(1+\varepsilon) = \varkappa\delta - \beta\varepsilon = -\frac{\varepsilon\beta}{2},$$

if only we set from the very beginning $\delta := \frac{\varepsilon\beta}{2\varkappa}$. The statement is proved. □

Remark 5.5. It is easy to see from the proof above, that the denominator 2 in the right-hand side of (5.16) can be changed on $1+\nu$, for an arbitrary $\nu \in (0,1)$; then $t_0 = t_0(\varepsilon,\nu)$.

Because of (1.20), we immediately gets the following corollary.

Corollary 5.6. *Let the assumptions* (A1), (A2) *and* (A5) *hold. Then the statement of Theorem 5.4 remains true for $w(x,t)$ replaced by $u(x,t)$ which is the solution to* (1.1).

We are going to find now, for a given probability kernel a, a proper ω to validate (5.15). We will always assume that a is bounded by a radially symmetric function, namely:

$$\begin{gathered} \text{There exists } b^+ \in \mathcal{D}_d(\mathbb{R}), \text{ such that} \\ a(x) \leq b^+(|x|), \text{ for a.a. } x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \end{gathered} \tag{5.20}$$

We start with the following sufficient condition.

Proposition 5.7. *Let* (5.20) *hold with $b^+ \in \mathcal{D}_d(\mathbb{R})$ which is log-equivalent, cf. Definition 2.26, to the function b, given by*

$$b(s) := \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+}(s)\frac{M}{(1+s)^{d+\mu}}, \quad s \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{5.21}$$

for some $\mu, M > 0$. Then there exists $\alpha_0 \in (0,1)$, such that, for all $\alpha \in (\alpha_0, 1)$, the function $\omega(x) = b(|x|)^\alpha$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, satisfies (5.15).

Proof. Set $\alpha_0 := \dfrac{d+\frac{\mu}{2}}{d+\mu} \in (0,1)$. Take arbitrary $\alpha \in (\alpha_0, 1)$ and $\epsilon \in (0, 1-\alpha)$. Take also an arbitrary $\delta \in (0,1)$, and define $h(s) = s^\delta$, $s > 0$. By (2.25), applied to $b_1 = b$ and $b_2 = b^+$, there exists $s_\delta > 2r$ such that, for all $s > s_\delta$,

$$h(s) < \frac{s}{2}, \qquad b^+(s) \leq \big(b(s)\big)^{1-\epsilon}. \tag{5.22}$$

For an arbitrary $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $|x| > s_\delta$, we have a disjoint expansion $\mathbb{R}^d = D_1(x) \sqcup D_2(x) \sqcup D_3(x)$, where

$$D_1(x) := \big\{|y| \leq h(|x|)\big\}, \quad D_2(x) := \Big\{h(|x|) < |y| \leq \frac{|x|}{2}\Big\},$$

$$D_3(x) = \Big\{|y| \geq \frac{|x|}{2}\Big\}.$$

Then, $\frac{(a*\omega)(x)}{\omega(x)} = I_1(x) + I_2(x) + I_3(x)$, where

$$I_j(x) := \int_{D_j(x)} a(y) \frac{(1+|x|)^{(d+\mu)\alpha}}{(1+|x-y|)^{(d+\mu)\alpha}} dy, \quad j = 1, 2, 3.$$

Using the inequality $|x-y| \geq \big||x|-|y|\big|$, $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, one has that $|x-y| \geq |x|-|y| \geq |x|-|x|^\delta$ for $y \in D_1(x)$, $|x| > s_\delta$. Then

$$I_1(x) \leq \left(\frac{1+|x|}{1+|x|-|x|^\delta}\right)^{(d+\mu)\alpha} \int_{D_1(x)} a(y) dy \to 1, \quad |x| \to \infty.$$

Next, we evidently have, for any $|y| < \frac{|x|}{2}$, that $1+|x-y| \geq 1+|x|-|y| \geq \frac{1}{2}(1+|x|)$; therefore,

$$I_2(x) \leq 2^{(d+\mu)\alpha} \int_{\{|y|>|x|^\delta\}} a(y) dy \to 0, \quad |x| \to \infty.$$

Finally, by (5.20) and (5.22), the inclusions $y \in D_3(x)$ and $|x| > s_\delta$ imply

$$a(y) \leq b^+(|y|) \leq b(|y|)^{1-\epsilon} \leq b\Big(\frac{|x|}{2}\Big)^{1-\epsilon},$$

and, therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} I_3(x) &\leq M \frac{(1+|x|)^{(d+\mu)\alpha}}{\Big(1+\frac{|x|}{2}\Big)^{(d+\mu)(1-\epsilon)}} \int_{D_3(x)} \frac{1}{(1+|x-y|)^{(d+\mu)\alpha_0}} dy \\ &\leq M \frac{(1+|x|)^{(d+\mu)\alpha}}{\Big(1+\frac{|x|}{2}\Big)^{(d+\mu)(1-\epsilon)}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{(1+|y|)^{d+\frac{\mu}{2}}} dy \to 0, \quad |x| \to \infty, \end{aligned}$$

as $1-\epsilon > \alpha$. Since b is decreasing on $\mathbb{R}_+$, we have, by (5.8), that, for any $\lambda > 0$, there exists $\rho_\lambda > 0$, such that $\Omega_\lambda = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : |x| > \rho_\lambda\}$. As a result, one gets (5.15) from the above. □

Therefore, under quite weak assumption (5.20) on $a \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$, with b^+ log-equivalent to b given by (5.21), one gets (5.16) for $\omega(x) = b(|x|)^\alpha$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ (i.e. $\omega \in \mathcal{R}$). We are going to enhance this result in three directions. First, we will get the corresponding result for the case when a decays faster than polynomial. Next, we will show how to get (5.16) with an $\omega \in \mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{M}$. Finally, we will show how to enhance the results by dropping the α appeared.

We start with the following two lemmas.

Lemma 5.8. *Let $b \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$ be even, positive, decreasing to 0 on the whole $\mathbb{R}_+$, and long-tailed function. Suppose that there exist $B, r_b, \rho_b > 0$, such that*

$$\int_{r_b}^{\infty} b(s-\tau) b(\tau)\, d\tau \leq B b(s), \quad s > \rho_b. \tag{5.23}$$

Suppose also that

$$\lim_{|x|\to\infty} \frac{a(x)|x|^{d-1}}{b(|x|)} = 0. \tag{5.24}$$

Then the inequality (5.15) *holds for $\omega(x) := b(|x|)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$.*

Proof. The assumption (5.24) implies that

$$g(r) := \sup_{|x|\geq r} \frac{a(x)|x|^{d-1}}{\omega(x)} \to 0, \quad r \to \infty. \tag{5.25}$$

Take an arbitrary $\delta \in (0,1)$. By (5.25), one can take then $r = r(\delta) > r_b$ such that $g(r) < \delta$.

Next, by Lemma 3.18 and Remark 3.19, the inequality (3.20) holds for $c = \omega$. Therefore, there exists $\rho = \rho(\delta, r) = \rho(\delta) > \max\{r, \rho_b\}$, such that

$$\sup_{|y|\leq r} \frac{\omega(x-y)}{\omega(x)} < 1 + \delta, \quad |x| \geq \rho. \tag{5.26}$$

Then, by (5.25) and (5.26), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(a * \omega)(x) &= \omega(x) \int_{\{|y|\leq r\}} a(y) \frac{\omega(x-y)}{\omega(x)} dy \\
&\quad + \omega(x) \int_{\{|y|\geq r\}} \frac{a(y)|y|^{d-1}}{\omega(y)} \frac{\omega(x-y)\omega(y)}{\omega(x)|y|^{d-1}} dy \\
&\leq \omega(x)(1+\delta) \int_{|y|\leq r} a(y) dy \\
&\quad + g(r)\omega(x) \int_{\{|y|\geq r\}} \frac{b(|x-y|)b(|y|)}{b(|x|)|y|^{d-1}} dy,
\end{aligned}$$

and using that b is decreasing on $\mathbb{R}_+$ and the inequality $|x-y| \geq \big||x|-|y|\big|$, one gets, cf. (1.2) and recall that $g(r) < \delta$,

$$\leq \omega(x)(1+\delta) + \delta\omega(x) \int_{\{|y|\geq r\}} \frac{b\big(\big||x|-|y|\big|\big)b(|y|)}{b(|x|)|y|^{d-1}} dy,$$

and using the spherical coordinates, one gets

$$\leq \omega(x)(1+\delta) + \delta\omega(x)\sigma_d \int_r^\infty \frac{b\big(|x|-p\big)b(p)}{b(|x|)} dp, \tag{5.27}$$

where σ_d is the hyper-surface area of a unit sphere in $\mathbb{R}^d$ (note that we have omitted an absolute value, as b is even). Finally, using that $r > r_b$ and $\rho > \rho_b$, we obtain from (5.23) and (5.27) that, for any $\delta \in (0,1)$,

$$(a * \omega)(x) \leq \omega(x)\big(1 + \delta(1 + \sigma_d B)\big), \quad |x| > \rho(\delta),$$

that implies the statement. □

Lemma 5.9. *Let $b \in \mathcal{S}_1(\mathbb{R})$ be an even function. Suppose that there exists $\alpha' \in (0,1)$ such that $b^{\alpha'} \in \mathcal{D}_d(\mathbb{R})$, i.e.*

$$\int_0^\infty b(s)^{\alpha'} s^{d-1}\, ds < \infty, \tag{5.28}$$

and, for any $\alpha \in (\alpha', 1)$,

$$\lim_{|x|\to\infty} \frac{a(x)}{b(|x|)^\alpha} |x|^{d-1} = 0. \tag{5.29}$$

Then there exists $\alpha_0 \in (\alpha', 1)$ *such that the inequality* (5.15) *holds for* $\omega(x) = b(|x|)^\alpha$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ *for all* $\alpha \in (\alpha_0, 1)$.

Proof. We apply the second part of Theorem 2.23, for $n = 1$; note that then (5.28) implies (2.14). As a result, for any $\alpha \in (\alpha_0, 1)$, the inequality (2.18) holds; in particular, then (5.23) holds with b replaced by b^α. The latter together with (5.29) allows to apply Lemma 5.8 for b replaced by b^α, that fulfils the statement. □

Remark 5.10. Note that, by Remark 3.3, (5.28) implies that $b \in \mathcal{D}_d(\mathbb{R})$ and hence, cf. Definition 2.19, $b \in \mathcal{S}_d(\mathbb{R})$.

As a result, one gets a counterpart of Proposition 5.7, for the case when the function b^+ in (5.20) decays faster than polynomial and $d > 1$.

Proposition 5.11. *Let* (5.20) *hold for a function* $b^+ \in \mathcal{D}_d(\mathbb{R})$ *which is loq-equivalent to a function* $b \in \mathcal{S}_1(\mathbb{R})$. *For* $d > 1$, *we suppose, additionally, that*

$$\lim_{s\to\infty} b(s) s^\nu = 0, \qquad \text{for all } \nu \geq 1. \tag{5.30}$$

Then there exists $\alpha_0 \in (0, 1)$, *such that, for all* $\alpha \in (\alpha_0, 1)$, *the function* $\omega(x) = b(|x|)^\alpha$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ *satisfies* (5.15).

Proof. We will use Lemma 5.9. For $d > 1$, one gets from (5.30) that, for any $\nu > 0$, there exists $\rho_\nu \geq 1$, such that $b(s) \leq s^{-\nu}$, $s > \rho_\nu$. In particular, for any $\alpha' \in (0, 1)$, one has (5.28). For $d = 1$, $\sigma = 0$, we use instead that $b \in \mathcal{S}_1(\mathbb{R})$ implies (2.15), and hence we get (5.28), if only $\alpha' \in \left(\frac{1}{1+\delta}, 1\right)$.

Next, for any $d \in \mathbb{N}$, choose an arbitrary $\alpha \in (\alpha', 1)$. Then, by (5.20) and (2.25) applied for $b_1 = b$ and $b_2 = b^+$, we have that, for any $\epsilon \in (0, 1-\alpha)$, there exists $\rho_\epsilon > 0$, such that, for all $|x| > \rho_\varepsilon$,

$$\frac{a(x)}{b(|x|)^\alpha} |x|^{d-1} \leq b(|x|)^{1-\epsilon-\alpha} |x|^{d-1} = \Big(b(|x|)|x|^\nu\Big)^{1-\epsilon-\alpha}, \tag{5.31}$$

where $\nu = \dfrac{d-1}{1-\epsilon-\alpha} \geq 0$, as $\alpha < 1 - \epsilon$. Clearly, (5.31) together with (5.30), in the case $d > 1$, imply (5.29), that fulfills the statement. □

Remark 5.12. Note that, in Proposition 5.7, for the function b given by (5.21), one can choose $\alpha' \in (0, 1)$ such that (5.28) holds. The same property we have checked above for the function b which satisfies assumptions of Proposition 5.11. As a result, by Remark 3.3, the functions $\omega(x) = b(|x|)^\alpha$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ in these Propositions are integrable for all $\alpha \in (\alpha_0, 1)$.

Now we are going to find examples of $\omega \in \mathcal{I}$ such that (5.15) holds. We start with the following definition.

Definition 5.13. Let $p \in \mathcal{R}$ be constructed by a function $b \in \mathcal{D}_d(\mathbb{R})$, i.e. $p(x) = b(|x|)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. For any $\lambda \in \big(0, b(0)\big)$, we set

$$\Theta_\lambda(p) := \big\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \Delta(x) \subset \Omega_\lambda(p)\big\}, \tag{5.32}$$

where $\Delta(x)$ is given by (3.1).

Remark 5.14. Let $\rho_{\lambda,b} > 0$ be the unique number such that $b\big(\rho_{\lambda,b}\big) = \lambda$. Then, evidently, $\Omega_\lambda(p) = \big\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : |x| > \rho_{\lambda,b}\big\}$. Therefore, by (3.8), one gets, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\langle x\rangle > \rho_{\lambda,b}$ and for any $y \in \Delta(x)$, that $|y| > \rho_{\lambda,b}$, and hence $y \in \Omega_\lambda(p)$. As a result,

$$\big\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \langle x\rangle > \rho_{\lambda,b}\big\} \subset \Theta_\lambda(p);$$

in particular, the latter set is not empty.

Proposition 5.15. *Let $p \in \mathcal{R}$ be constructed by a function $b \in \mathcal{D}_d(\mathbb{R})$. Suppose that* (5.15) *holds with $\omega = p$ and $\Omega_\lambda = \Omega_\lambda(p)$. Let $c \in \mathcal{I}$ be given by* (3.4)*. Then the following analogue to* (5.15) *holds:*

$$\lim_{\lambda\to 0+} \sup_{x\in\Theta_\lambda(p)} \frac{(a * c)(x)}{c(x)} \le 1. \tag{5.33}$$

Proof. Take an arbitrary $\delta \in (0, 1)$. By (5.15) with $\omega = p$, there exists $\lambda_0 = \lambda_0(\delta)$, such that, for all $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0)$, we have, cf. (5.13),

$$\frac{(a * p)(x)}{p(x)} \le 1 + \delta, \quad x \in \Omega_\lambda(p). \tag{5.34}$$

Next, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, one gets

$$\begin{aligned}(a * c)(x) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} a(x - y) \int_{\Delta(y)} p(z)\, dz\, dy \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} a(x - y) \int_{\Delta(x)} p(z - (x - y))\, dz\, dy \\ &= \int_{\Delta(x)} (a * p)(z)\, dz\end{aligned}$$

As a result, by (5.34) and (5.32), we have that, for any $x \in \Theta_\lambda(p)$,

$$\frac{(a * c)(x)}{c(x)} = \frac{\displaystyle\int_{\Delta(x)} \frac{(a * p)(z)}{p(z)} p(z)\, dz}{c(x)} \le 1 + \delta.$$

Since the latter holds for any $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0)$, one gets the statement. □

To get from (5.33) the inequality (5.15) with $\omega = c$ and $\Omega_\lambda = \Omega_\lambda(c)$, consider the following lemma.

Lemma 5.16. *Let $p \in \mathcal{R}$ be constructed by a long-tailed function $b \in \mathcal{D}_d(\mathbb{R})$ (for example, let $p \in \mathcal{L}$). Let $c \in \mathcal{I}$ be given by* (3.4)*. Then there exists $\lambda_1 > 0$, such that, for all $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_1)$,*

$$\Omega_\lambda(c) \subset \Theta_\lambda(p).$$

Proof. By Lemma 3.18 and Remark 3.19, we have that (3.20) holds with c replaced by p. As a result, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and $r > 0$, there exists $R = R(\varepsilon, r) > 0$, such that

$$p(x + y) \ge (1 - \varepsilon)p(x), \quad |y| \le r,\ |x| \ge R.$$

Therefore, $x \in \Omega_\lambda(c)$ with $|x| \geq R$ implies that

$$\lambda \geq \int_{x_1}^{x_1+\frac{r}{\sqrt{d}}} \dots \int_{x_d}^{x_d+\frac{r}{\sqrt{d}}} b\Big(\sqrt{y_1^2+\ldots+y_d^2}\Big)\, dy_1 \dots dy_d$$
$$\geq \frac{r^d}{d^{\frac{d}{2}}} p\Big(x + \Big(\frac{r}{\sqrt{d}}, \dots, \frac{r}{\sqrt{d}}\Big)\Big) \geq \frac{r^d}{d^{\frac{d}{2}}}(1-\varepsilon)p(x).$$

Choose now $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2}$ and $r = 2^{\frac{1}{d}}\sqrt{d} > 0$, and consider the corresponding R. Since $\lambda \downarrow 0$ if and only if $\langle x \rangle \to \infty$, there exists $\lambda_1 > 0$ such that, for all $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_1)$, the inclusion $x \in \Omega_\lambda(c)$ implies $\langle x \rangle > R$ and hence $|x| > R$. Moreover, for any $y \in \Delta(x)$, we have that $y \in \Omega_\lambda(c)$, by the monotonicity of c in each of variables; and, by (3.8), $\langle x \rangle > R$ implies $|y| > R$. As a result, for any $y \in \Delta(x)$ (including $y = x$), we have that $p(y) \leq \lambda$, i.e $\Delta(x) \subset \Omega_\lambda(p)$. Then, by (5.32), $x \in \Theta_\lambda(p)$, that proves the statement. □

Theorem 5.17. *Let $b : \mathbb{R} \to (0, \infty)$ be an even long-tailed function decreasing on $\mathbb{R}_+$ to 0, such that for some $\alpha_0 \in \big(\frac{3}{4}, 1\big)$, $b^{\alpha_0} \in \mathcal{D}_d(\mathbb{R})$; and, for any $\alpha \in (\alpha_0, 1)$, the inequality* (5.15) *holds with $\omega(x) = b(|x|)^\alpha$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. (In particular, let the conditions of either Proposition 5.7 or Proposition 5.11 hold.) Let $c \in \mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{I}$ be constructed by the function b in the sense of Definition 3.2. Suppose that $0 \leq u_0 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\|u_0\|_c < \infty$; and let $w = w(x,t)$ be the corresponding solution to* (1.19). *Then there exists $\varepsilon_0 \in (0,1)$, such that, for any $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$, there exist $A_\varepsilon > 0$ and $\tau = \tau(\varepsilon) > 0$, such that*

$$\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{x \notin \Lambda_\varepsilon^+(t,c)} w(x,t) \leq \big(A_\varepsilon + B\|u_0\|_c\big) e^{-\frac{\varepsilon\beta}{4}t}, \quad t \geq \tau, \tag{5.35}$$

where $B := \max\big\{1, b(0)^{1-\alpha_0}\big\}$.

Proof. First, we note that by Remark 3.3, $b^{\alpha_0} \in \mathcal{D}_d(\mathbb{R})$ implies $b \in \mathcal{D}_d(\mathbb{R})$. Next, let $\alpha_0 \in \big(\frac{3}{4}, 1\big)$ be given. For any b decreasing on $\mathbb{R}_+$ and for any $\alpha \in (\alpha_0, 1)$,

$$b(|x|)^\alpha = \left(\frac{b(|x|)}{b(0)}\right)^\alpha b(0)^\alpha \geq \frac{b(|x|)}{b(0)^{1-\alpha}},$$

since $b(|x|) \leq b(0)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Let $c_\alpha \in \mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{I}$ be given by (3.5). Then, $\|u_0\|_c < \infty$ implies

$$\frac{u_0(x)}{c_\alpha(x)} \leq \frac{u_0(x)}{c(x)} b(0)^{1-\alpha} \leq \|u_0\|_c \max\big\{1, b(0)^{1-\alpha_0}\big\}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

i.e. $\|u_0\|_{c_\alpha} \leq B\|u_0\|_c$, where $B = \max\big\{1, b(0)^{1-\alpha_0}\big\}$.

Let $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(\alpha_0)$ by given by Theorem 3.12. Take an arbitrary $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ and consider $\alpha = \alpha(\varepsilon) \in (\alpha_0, 1)$ also given by Theorem 3.12. By the assumed, (5.15) holds for $\omega = p^\alpha$, where $p(x) = b(|x|)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Therefore, for $c \in \mathcal{R}$, one gets that (5.15) holds for $\omega = c_\alpha \in \mathcal{R}$, cf. Remark 3.4. Let now $c \in \mathcal{I}$. Since b is long-tailed, the function b^α is long-tailed as well. Then, one can use Lemma 5.16 with p replaced by b^α; one gets then, for some $\lambda_1 > 0$,

$$\Omega_\lambda(c_\alpha) \subset \Theta_\lambda(p^\alpha), \quad \lambda \in (0, \lambda_1).$$

Therefore, Proposition 5.15 implies that (5.15) holds for $\omega = c_\alpha \in \mathcal{I}$.

As a result, one can use now Theorem 5.4 with $\omega = c_\alpha \in \mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{I}$ and ε replaced by $\frac{\varepsilon}{2}$. Namely, there exist $A_\varepsilon > 0$ and $t_0 = t_0(\varepsilon) > 0$, such that

$$\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{x \notin \Lambda^+_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}(t,c_\alpha)} w(x,t) \le \big(A_\varepsilon + B\|u_0\|_c\big) e^{-\frac{\varepsilon\beta}{4}t}, \quad t \ge t_0. \tag{5.36}$$

On the other hand, by Theorem 3.12, there exists $\tau = \tau(\varepsilon) > 0$, such that (3.10) holds, i.e.

$$\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Lambda^+_\varepsilon(t,c) \subset \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Lambda^+_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}(t,c_\alpha), \quad t \ge \tau. \tag{5.37}$$

Combining (5.36) and (5.37), one gets (5.35). □

Again, because of (1.20), we immediately gets the following corollary.

Corollary 5.18. *Let the assumptions* (A1)*,* (A2) *and* (A5) *hold. Then the statement of Theorem 5.17 remains true for $w(x,t)$ replaced by $u(x,t)$ which is the solution to* (1.1)*.*

Remark 5.19. By Corollary 3.15 and Remark 3.16, one can get (5.35) for any c constructed in the sense of Definition 3.2 by a function $b_1 : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ which is tail-decreasing only and such that $\log b_1(s) \sim \log b(s)$, $s \to \infty$.

Remark 5.20. Using a bit more cumbersome expressions for ε_0 and $\alpha = \alpha(\varepsilon)$, $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ in the proof of Theorem 3.12, one can obtain (3.10) with $\frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ replaced by any $\varepsilon' \in (0, \varepsilon)$. As a result, we may apply Theorem 5.4 inside the proof of Theorem 5.17 with ε replaced by $\frac{\varepsilon}{1+\nu'}$ for any $\nu' \in (0,1)$. Combining this observation with Remark 5.5, one can get, as a result, (5.35), where, in the denominator of the right-hand side, the number 4 will be replaced by $1+\nu''$ for an arbitrary $\nu'' \in (0,1)$, by a redefining of $\tau = \tau(\varepsilon, \nu'')$.

Remark 5.21. For $c \in \mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{I}$, the condition $\|u_0\|_c < \infty$ separates, in some sense, the cases of 'decreasing' and 'symmetric' initial conditions. Namely, if, for example, $u_0 \in \mathcal{M}$, then the inequality $\|u_0\|_c < \infty$ is impossible for any $c \in \mathcal{R}$, cf. (5.2); and hence c must be from $\mathcal{I}$.

6 Corollaries and examples

The aim of this Section is to provide useful sufficient conditions on functions a and u_0 to get simultaneously (4.21) and (5.35), i.e., in particular, to get that

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \operatorname*{ess\,inf}_{x \in \Lambda^-_\varepsilon(t,c)} u(x,t) = \theta, \qquad \lim_{t\to\infty} \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{x \notin \Lambda^+_\varepsilon(t,c)} u(x,t) = 0, \tag{6.1}$$

if only $c \in \mathcal{L} \cup \mathcal{N}$ and ε is small enough.

Through this section we will always assume that the assumptions (A1)–(A6) hold true. As an reinforcement of (5.20), consider the assumptions below.

Suppose that there exist constants $\mu, M, \delta, \rho, r, R_0 > 0$, a point $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and

functions $b^+ \in \mathcal{D}_d(\mathbb{R})$, $b_+ : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_+$, $v^\circ \in \mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{M}$, $v_\circ : \mathbb{R}^d \to [0, \theta]$, such that

$$b_+(|x|) \le a(x) \le b^+(|x|), \qquad \text{for a.a. } x \in \mathbb{R}^d; \tag{B1}$$

$$b^+(s) \le \frac{M}{(1+s)^{d+\mu}}, \qquad \text{for a.a. } s \ge r; \tag{B2}$$

$$b_+(s) \ge \delta, \qquad \text{for a.a. } s \in [0, \rho]; \tag{B3}$$

$$\theta \ge v^\circ(x) \ge u_0(x) \ge v_\circ(x), \qquad \text{for a.a. } x \in \mathbb{R}^d; \tag{B4}$$

$$v_\circ(x) \ge \delta, \qquad \text{for a.a. } x \in B_\rho(x_0). \tag{B5}$$

To simplify the formulations below, let us introduce the set $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbb{R}) \subset \mathcal{S}_d(\mathbb{R})$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$ as follows. Let $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_1(\mathbb{R}) := \mathcal{S}_1(\mathbb{R})$, whereas, for $d > 1$, let $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_d(\mathbb{R})$ be the set of all functions $b \in \mathcal{S}_d(\mathbb{R})$, such that b is either given by (5.21) for some $M, \mu > 0$ or b satisfies (5.30).

We will distinguish several cases. They are described below a bit informally, leaving the exact formulations to the corresponding Propositions (note that if $b_+ = b^+$, $v_\circ = v^\circ$ in the above, then those descriptions become exact).

Case 1. $\lim\limits_{|x| \to \infty} u_0(x) = 0$.

Subcase 1.1. $\sup\limits_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \dfrac{u_0(x)}{a(x)} < \infty$.

Proposition 6.1. *Let* (A1)–(A6) *and* (B1)–(B5) *hold. Suppose that* $b_+ \in \mathcal{D}_d(\mathbb{R})$ *is a long-tailed and tail-log-convex function, and let both* b_+ *and* b^+ *be log-equivalent, cf. Definition 2.26, to a function* $b \in \widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_d(\mathbb{R})$. *Suppose also that*

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{u_0(x)}{b(|x|)} < \infty. \tag{6.2}$$

Then there exist $\varepsilon_0 \in (0,1)$ *and* $B > 0$ *such that, for any* $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$, *there exists* $A = A(\varepsilon) > 0$ *and* $t_1 = t_1(\varepsilon) > 0$, *such that* (4.21) *and* (5.35) *both hold for* $c(x) = b(|x|)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Proof. Let $\varepsilon_0 \in (0,1)$ be chosen later. Take an arbitrary $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$.

Let $c_+ \in \mathcal{L} \subset L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be constructed by $b_+ \in \mathcal{D}_d(\mathbb{R})$, cf. Definition 3.2. Then (6.2) implies that $u_0 \in L_1(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Therefore, one can apply Proposition 4.10 with $c = c_+ > 0$ and $f = u_0$; namely, there exists $D > 0$, such that $a * u_0 \ge c_+ * u_0 \ge D c_+ \in \mathcal{L}$. Then, by Theorem 4.9, for any $\varepsilon_1 \in (0, \varepsilon)$, we have that (4.21) holds, with ε replaced by ε_1 and c replaced by Dc_+. By (3.7),

$$\Lambda^-_{\varepsilon_1}(t, Dc_+) = \big\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : |x| \le \eta^-_{\varepsilon_1}(t, Db_+)\big\}.$$

By the assumed, $\log(Db_+)(s) \sim \log b(s)$, $s \to \infty$. Therefore, one can apply Proposition 2.31; namely, by (2.35) with $b_1 = b$, $b_2 = Db_+$, we have that $\Lambda^-_\varepsilon(t, b) \subset \Lambda^-_{\varepsilon_1}(t, Dc_+)$, and hence (4.21) holds, with $c(x) = b(|x|)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Note that we had not any restrictions on ε_0 here.

If $d = 1$ or if $d > 1$ and, additionally, (5.30) holds, then one can apply Proposition 5.11. If $d > 1$ and (5.30) does not hold, then, by the assumed, b is given by (5.21), and one can apply Proposition 5.7. In both cases, there exists $\alpha_1 \in (0,1)$, such that, for all $\alpha \in (\alpha_1, 1)$, the function $\omega(x) = b(|x|)^\alpha$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

satisfies (5.15). Moreover, we have shown in the proof of Proposition 5.11, that there exists $\alpha' \in (0,1)$, such that (5.28) holds. As a result, taking any $\alpha_0 \in \big(\max\{\frac{3}{4}, \alpha_1, \alpha'\}, 1\big)$, we will fulfill all conditions of Corollary 5.18 (those are conditions of Theorem 5.17), i.e. one can choose above $\varepsilon_0 \in (0,1)$, such that (5.35) holds, with $c(x) = b(|x|)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. □

Subcase 1.2. $\lim\limits_{|x|\to\infty} \dfrac{a(x)}{u_0(x)} = 0.$

Proposition 6.2. *Let* (A1)–(A6) *and* (B1)–(B5) *hold. Let* $v^\circ, v_\circ \in \mathcal{R}$ *be constructed by* $b_\circ, b^\circ \in \mathcal{D}_d(\mathbb{R})$. *Suppose that* $b_\circ$ *is long-tailed and tail-log-convex,* $b^\circ \in \widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_d(\mathbb{R})$, *and let both* $b_\circ$ *and* b° *be log-equivalent to a function* $b \in \widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_d(\mathbb{R})$. *Assume also that*

$$\lim_{|x|\to\infty} \frac{a(x)}{b^\circ(|x|)} |x|^{d-1} = 0. \tag{6.3}$$

Then there exist $\varepsilon_0 \in (0,1)$ *and* $B > 0$ *such that, for any* $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$, *there exists* $A = A(\varepsilon) > 0$ *and* $t_1 = t_1(\varepsilon) > 0$, *such that* (4.21) *and* (5.35) *both hold, for* $c(x) = b(|x|)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Proof. Let $\varepsilon_0 \in (0,1)$ be chosen later. Take an arbitrary $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$.

The proof of (4.21) is essentially the same as that for Proposition 6.1, with only the difference that we will apply now Proposition 4.10 for $c = c_\circ > 0$ and $f = a \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$, where $c_\circ(x) := b_\circ(|x|)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

To prove (5.35), we are going to apply Theorem 5.4 to $\omega(x) = b^\circ(|x|)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Clearly, by (B4), $\|u_0\|_\omega < \infty$. It remains to check (5.15). By the proof of Theorem 2.23, the inclusion $b^\circ \in \mathcal{S}_d(\mathbb{R})$ implies the first inequality in (2.20) with b replaced by b°. This evidently yields (5.23), also with b replaced by b°. Therefore, because of (6.3), one can use Lemma 5.8, and we get (5.15). As a result, we may apply Theorem 5.4: there exists $\varepsilon_0 \in (0,1)$ such that (5.16) holds with ε replaced by $\frac{\varepsilon}{2} < \varepsilon_0$. The rest of the proof will be similar to that in the proof of Proposition 6.1: by using the log-equivalence of b° and b, (3.7), Proposition 2.31, and the evident inequality $\|u_0\|_{b^\circ} \le \|u_0\|_b$, one gets (5.35). □

Remark 6.3. Because of the assumption $\|u_0\|_\omega < \infty$ in Theorem 5.4, one has to have $b^\circ \in \widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_d(\mathbb{R})$ instead of just $b \in \widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_d(\mathbb{R})$. A sufficient condition to get the latter inclusion from the former one is given by Proposition 2.27.

Case 2. $\lim\limits_{\rho\to\infty} u_0((\rho,\dots,\rho)) = 0$, $\lim\limits_{\rho\to-\infty} u_0((\rho,\dots,\rho)) \in (0,\theta]$.

Subcase 2.1. $\sup\limits_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d} \dfrac{u_0(x)}{\int_{\Delta(x)} a(y)dy} < \infty.$

Proposition 6.4. *Let* (A1)–(A6) *and* (B1)–(B5) *hold. Let all assumptions of Proposition 6.1 but* (6.2) *hold. Instead of* (6.2), *we suppose that*

1) there exists $\xi \in (0,\theta)$, *such that*

$$v_\circ(x) \ge \zeta \, \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}^d_-}(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \ \mathbb{R}_- := (-\infty, 0], \tag{6.4}$$

2) for the function $c \in \mathcal{I}$ constructed by b, cf. Definition 3.2, one has that

$$\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{u_0(x)}{c(x)} < \infty.$$

Then there exist $\varepsilon_0 \in (0,1)$ and $B > 0$ such that, for any $\varepsilon \in (0,\varepsilon_0)$, there exists $A = A(\varepsilon) > 0$ and $t_1 = t_1(\varepsilon) > 0$, such that (4.21) *and* (5.35) *both hold for the function c.*

Proof. Let $\varepsilon_0 \in (0,1)$ be chosen later. Take an arbitrary $\varepsilon \in (0,\varepsilon_0)$. As we have mentioned above, the assumptions about q_+ and b_+ imply that $c_+ \in \mathcal{L}$, where $c_+(x) := b_+(|x|)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then, by (B1),

$$\begin{aligned}(a * u_0)(x) &\geq \zeta \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} c_+(y) \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}^d_-}(x-y)\,dy \\ &= \zeta \int_{\Delta(x)} c_+(y)\,dy =: \tilde{c}(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d;\end{aligned}$$

and hence $\tilde{c} \in \mathcal{N}$. Thus, one can apply Theorem 4.9 to get (4.21) with c replaced by $\tilde{c}$ and ε replaced by $\frac{\varepsilon}{2}$. Next, by the log-equivalence between b and b^+, we have that (2.24) holds for $b_1 = b$, $b_2 = \zeta b_+$. Therefore, we can apply Corollary 3.15 with $c^{(1)}(x) = c(x) := \int_{\Delta(x)} b(|y|)dy$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $c^{(2)} = \tilde{c}$, see also Remark 3.16; and then (3.17) leads to (4.21) for this c.

To get (5.35) we will need just to repeat all corresponding arguments from Proposition 6.1 with only the difference that Corollary 5.18 will be applied now for the $c \in \mathcal{I}$. □

Remark 6.5. Using [28, Proposition 3.15] in the same way as in the proof of Theorem 4.9, one can replace $\mathbb{R}^d_-$ in (6.4) by $\bigtimes_{j=1}^{d} (-\infty, \overline{y}_j]$, for an arbitrary fixed $\overline{y} \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Remark 6.6. If, additionally, $u_0(x) = \int_{\Delta(x)} p(y)dy$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ for some $p \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$, then, evidently,

$$\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{p(x)}{a(x)} < \infty \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{u_0(x)}{\displaystyle\int_{\Delta(x)} a(y)dy} < \infty.$$

Subcase 2.2. $\displaystyle\lim_{\langle x\rangle\to\infty} \frac{\int_{\Delta(x)} a(y)|y|^{d-1}dy}{u_0(x)} = 0.$

Proposition 6.7. *Let* (A1)–(A6) *and* (B1)–(B5) *hold. Let $v^\circ, v_\circ \in \mathcal{I}$ be constructed by $b_\circ, b^\circ \in \mathcal{D}_d(\mathbb{R})$, cf. Definition 3.2. Suppose that all assumptions of Proposition 6.2 hold; and let $c \in \mathcal{I}$ be constructed by the function b. Then there exist $\varepsilon_0 \in (0,1)$ and $B > 0$ such that, for any $\varepsilon \in (0,\varepsilon_0)$, there exists $A = A(\varepsilon) > 0$ and $t_1 = t_1(\varepsilon) > 0$, such that* (4.21) *and* (5.35) *both hold.*

Proof. First, we apply Proposition 4.10 with $f = a$ and c replaced by $v_\circ$. Then, similarly to the proof of Proposition 6.4, we may apply Theorem 4.9 to get (4.21) with c replaced by $v_\circ$ and ε replaced by $\frac{\varepsilon}{2}$, and, by using the log-equivalence

between b and $b_\circ$, Corollary 3.15, and Remark 3.16, we will get (4.21) for the needed c.

Next, in the same way as in the proof of Proposition 6.2, we get (5.15) for $\omega(x) = b^\circ(|x|)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then we apply Proposition 5.15 with b replaced by b°. Hence one gets (5.33) with $c_\alpha = v^\circ$, and one can use Lemma 5.16, that implies (5.15) for $\omega = v^\circ$. Therefore, by Theorem 5.4, one has (5.35) with $\omega = v^\circ$ and ε replaced by $\frac{\varepsilon}{2}$. Again, now by the log-equivalence between b and b°, one can use Corollary 3.15 and Remark 3.16, cf. Remark 5.19, and then (3.18) yields the needed. □

Remark 6.8. It is easy to check that the convergence (6.3) indeed implies that

$$\lim_{\langle x\rangle\to\infty} \frac{\displaystyle\int_{\Delta(x)} a(y)|y|^{d-1}dy}{\displaystyle\int_{\Delta(x)} b^\circ(y)dy} = 0.$$

The following Corollary summarizes the statements above in the simplest case when $b_+ = b^+$ and $v_\circ = v^\circ$.

Corollary 6.9. *Let $b, q : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ be bounded functions such that* (B2) *holds for both $b^+ = b$ and $b^+ = q$, and $q(s) \geq \delta$, $s \in [0, \rho]$. Let* (A1)–(A6) *hold, and $a(x) = b(|x|)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Let one of the following conditions holds*

$$\sup_{s\in\mathbb{R}_+} \frac{q(s)}{b(s)} < \infty, \tag{6.5}$$

$$\lim_{s\to\infty} \frac{b(s)}{q(s)} s^{d-1} = 0. \tag{6.6}$$

1) Let $u_0(x) = q(|x|)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $q : \mathbb{R} \to [0, \theta]$. Then

(a) if $b \in \widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_d(\mathbb{R})$ and (6.5) *holds, then* (6.1) *holds with $c = a$;*

(b) if $q \in \widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_d(\mathbb{R})$ and (6.6) *holds, then* (6.1) *holds with $c = u_0$.*

2) Let $u_0(x) = \displaystyle\int_{\Delta(x)} q(|y|)dy$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\displaystyle\int_0^\infty q(s)s^{d-1}ds \in (0, \theta]$. Then

(a) if $b \in \widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_d(\mathbb{R})$ and (6.5) *holds, then* (6.1) *holds with*

$$c(x) := \int_{\Delta(x)} a(y)dy, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d;$$

(b) if $q \in \widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_d(\mathbb{R})$ and (6.6) *holds, then* (6.1) *holds with $c = u_0$.*

Proof. Note that $q(s) \geq \delta$, $s \in [0, \rho]$ implies

$$\int_{\Delta(x)} q(|y|)dy \geq \text{const} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}^d_-}(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

All other requirements of Propositions 6.1, 6.2, 6.4, 6.7 evidently hold true. □

Thus, informally speaking, in the Case 1, one gets (6.1) with $c = a$ or $c = u_0$, whichever decays slowly, whereas, in the Case 2, one gets (6.1) with $c = \int_\Delta a$ or $c = u_0$ whichever decays slowly (and provided that, in both cases, c has ''heavy tails').

Consider now several examples. In all of them we will suppose that the conditions (A1)–(A6) hold, and that u_0 is separated from 0 in a neighborhood of the origin.

Example 6.10. Let, for some $\mu > 0$, $\nu \geq 0$, $r, M > 1$, and $\delta \geq 0$, one of the following two pairs of conditions hold, for a.a. $|x| \geq r$,

$$\begin{gathered}(\log|x|)^{-\nu}(1+|x|)^{-d-\mu} \leq a(x) \leq (\log|x|)^{\nu}(1+|x|)^{-d-\mu}, \\ u_0(x) \leq M(1+|x|)^{-d-\mu},\end{gathered} \tag{6.7}$$

or if, additionally, $\delta + \nu > 0$,

$$\begin{gathered}(\log|x|)^{-\nu}(1+|x|)^{-d-\mu} \leq u_0(x) \leq (\log|x|)^{\nu}(1+|x|)^{-d-\mu}, \\ a(x) \leq M(1+|x|)^{-2d-\mu-1-\delta},\end{gathered} \tag{6.8}$$

Then, for (6.7), we just apply Proposition 6.1 with $b(s) = (1+s)^{-(d+\mu)}$.

For (6.8), we will use Proposition 6.2 with $b(s) = (1+s)^{-(d+\mu)}$ and $b^\circ(s) = (\log s)^\nu b(s)$; then $b^\circ \in \mathcal{S}_d(\mathbb{R})$, see Subsubsection 2.3.1. Note that then

$$\frac{a(x)}{b^\circ(|x|)}|x|^{d-1} \leq \frac{M(1+|x|)^{d+\mu}}{(\log|x|)^\nu(1+|x|)^{2d+\mu-1+\delta}}|x|^{d-1} = \frac{M}{(\log|x|)^\nu|x|^\delta} \to 0,$$

as $|x| \to \infty$, if only $\delta + \nu > 0$.

In both cases, we will get, see again Subsubsection 2.3.1, that there exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, such that, for any $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$,

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \operatorname*{ess\,inf}_{|x|\leq \exp\left(\frac{\beta(1-\varepsilon)t}{d+\mu}\right)} u(x,t) = \theta, \qquad \lim_{t\to\infty} \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{|x|\geq \exp\left(\frac{\beta(1+\varepsilon)t}{d+\mu}\right)} u(x,t) = 0, \tag{6.9}$$

Example 6.11. Let now $d = 1$ and, for some $r, \mu, M > 0$, $\zeta \in (0, \theta)$,

$$\begin{gathered}a(x) = M(1+|x|)^{-1-\mu}, \quad |x| > r, \\ \zeta \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+}(x) \leq u_0(x) \leq \zeta \int_x^\infty a(y)dy \leq \theta, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \zeta \in (0,\theta),\end{gathered}$$

and u_0 is decreasing on $\mathbb{R}$. Then the front is described via the function

$$\int_x^\infty a(y)dy = \frac{M}{\mu+1}x^{-\mu},$$

if x is big enough. Therefore, by (2.33) and Proposition 6.4,

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \operatorname*{ess\,inf}_{x\leq \exp\left(\frac{\beta(1-\varepsilon)t}{\mu}\right)} u(x,t) = \theta, \qquad \lim_{t\to\infty} \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{x\geq \exp\left(\frac{\beta(1+\varepsilon)t}{\mu}\right)} u(x,t) = 0,$$

i.e. the motion of the front goes a bit faster than in (6.9) with $d = 1$.

Example 6.12. Let, for some $\nu, \mu \geq 0$, $r, M > 1$, and $\alpha \in (0,1)$, one of the following two pairs of conditions hold, for a.a. $|x| \geq r$,

$$(1+|x|)^{-\nu}\exp(-|x|^\alpha) \leq a(x) \leq (1+|x|)^{\nu}\exp(-|x|^\alpha),$$
$$u_0(x) \leq M\exp(-|x|^\alpha),$$

or if, additionally, $\nu + \mu > d-1$,

$$(1+|x|)^{-\nu}\exp(-|x|^\alpha) \leq u_0(x) \leq (1+|x|)^{\nu}\exp(-|x|^\alpha),$$
$$a(x) \leq M(1+|x|)^{-\mu}\exp(-|x|^\alpha),$$

Then, the same arguments as in Example 6.10 related to the function $b(s) = \exp(-s^\alpha)$ will imply that, cf. Subsubsection 2.3.3, there exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, such that, for any $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$,

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \operatorname*{ess\,inf}_{|x|\leq \left(\beta(1-\varepsilon)t\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}} u(x,t) = \theta, \qquad \lim_{t\to\infty} \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{|x|\geq \left(\beta(1+\varepsilon)t\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}} u(x,t) = 0, \tag{6.10}$$

Example 6.13. Let now $d = 1$ and, for some $r, M > 0$, $\zeta \in (0, \theta)$, $\alpha \in (0,1)$, one of the following two pairs of conditions hold

$$\begin{aligned} a(x) &= M\exp(-|x|^\alpha), \quad |x| > r, \\ \zeta \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+}(x) \leq u_0(x) &\leq \zeta \int_x^\infty a(y)dy \leq \theta, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \zeta \in (0,\theta), \end{aligned} \tag{6.11}$$

or if, additionally, $\mu > d-1$,

$$\begin{aligned} u_0(x) &= M\exp(-x^\alpha), \quad x > r, \\ a(x) &\leq M|x|^{\mu+\alpha-1}\exp(-|x|^\alpha), \quad |x| > r, \end{aligned} \tag{6.12}$$

and, in both cases, u_0 is decreasing on $\mathbb{R}$. Then, for (6.11), by Proposition 6.4, the front is described via the function $M\int_x^\infty \exp(-y^\alpha)dy$ for big enough x. Moreover, by Remark 5.19, the same representation will hold, up to the choice of ε, via the function

$$M\int_x^\infty y^{\alpha-1}\exp(-y^\alpha)dy = \frac{M}{\alpha}\exp(-x^\alpha), \tag{6.13}$$

since the integrands are logarithmically equivalent. Therefore,

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \operatorname*{ess\,inf}_{x\leq \left(\beta(1-\varepsilon)t\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}} u(x,t) = \theta, \qquad \lim_{t\to\infty} \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{x\geq \left(\beta(1+\varepsilon)t\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}} u(x,t) = 0, \tag{6.14}$$

i.e., in contrast to Example 6.11 the motion of the front is the same as in (6.10) with $d = 1$.

For (6.12), we have from (6.13) that $u_0(x) = \int_x^\infty b(y)dy$, where b is also logarithmically equivalent to $\exp(-x^\alpha)$. Therefore, by Proposition 6.7, one gets (6.14) as well.

In the last example, one shows that an 'intermediate' front propagation is possible as well.

Example 6.14. Let, for some $M, P, r, \alpha > 0$ and for all $|x| > r$

$$a(x) = M \exp\bigl(-(\alpha \log |x|)^2\bigr),$$
$$u_0(x) \le P \exp\bigl(-(\alpha \log |x|)^2\bigr).$$

Then, by Proposition 6.1 and Subsubsection 2.3.2, one gets

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \operatorname*{ess\,inf}_{|x|\le \exp\left(\sqrt{\alpha\beta(1-\varepsilon)t}\right)} u(x,t) = \theta,$$

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{|x|\ge \exp\left(\sqrt{\alpha\beta(1+\varepsilon)t}\right)} u(x,t) = 0.$$

Similarly, using Subsubsection 2.3.4, one can construct a and u_0, such that the front will be described approximately by $\beta(1 \pm \varepsilon)t(\log t)^\gamma$ for any $\gamma > 1$, that demonstrates slower motion than that in (6.10).

7 Estimates for solutions to nonlinear and linear equations

Bounds at infinity: the light-tailed case

We start with the case of light-tailed functions a and u_0. Namely, let S^{d-1} be the unit sphere in $\mathbb{R}^d$ centered at the origin, and take an arbitrary $\xi \in S^{d-1}$. Suppose that $a \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, a is separated from 0 in a neighborhood of the origin, and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x \cdot \xi| a(x) dx < \infty$. Here and below $x \cdot y$, $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ means the scalar product in $\mathbb{R}^d$.

First, we suppose also that $m \in (0, \varkappa)$, i.e. $\beta \in (0, \varkappa)$ in (A1). Define

$$\mathfrak{a}_\xi(\mu) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} a(x) e^{\mu x\cdot\xi} dx, \quad \mu > 0.$$

It was shown in [28, Section 4], that if, for some $\mu' > 0$, $\mathfrak{a}_\xi(\mu') < \infty$, then there exists $\mu_0(a) \in (0, \infty]$, such that $\mathfrak{a}_\xi(\mu) < \infty$ for all $0 < \mu < \mu_0(a)$. For any such μ, consider $\widetilde{\omega}_{\mu,\xi}(x) := e^{-\mu x\cdot\xi}$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then

$$\frac{(a * \widetilde{\omega}_{\mu,\xi})(x)}{\widetilde{\omega}_{\mu,\xi}(x)} = \mathfrak{a}_\xi(\mu), \quad \text{for a.a. } x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

By [28, Proposition 4.18] (one has to slightly change notations here), there exists a unique $\mu^*_\xi \in (0, \infty) \cap (0, \lambda_0(a)]$, such that

$$c^*_\xi := \frac{\varkappa \mathfrak{a}_\xi(\mu^*_\xi) - m}{\mu^*_\xi} = \min_{\mu>0} \frac{\varkappa \mathfrak{a}_\xi(\mu) - m}{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Set, for a shortness, cf. (A1),

$$\beta^*_\xi := \varkappa \mathfrak{a}_\xi(\mu^*_\xi) - m = \mu^*_\xi c^*_\xi \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Note that, by [28, Proposition 4.18], the condition

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} x \cdot \xi a^+(x)\, dx \ge 0 \tag{7.1}$$

implies $c^*_\xi > 0$, $\beta^*_\xi > 0$.

Suppose that $0 \le u_0 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and

$$\|u_0\|_{*,\xi} := \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d} u_0(x) e^{\mu^*_\xi x\cdot\xi} < \infty. \tag{7.2}$$

Let $w = w(x,t)$ be the solution to (1.19). Then, by Proposition 5.1 applied to $\widetilde{\omega}(x) = \widetilde{\omega}_{\mu^*_\xi,\xi}(x)$,

$$0 \le w(x,t) \le \|u_0\|_{*,\xi} e^{\beta^*_\xi t - \mu^*_\xi x\cdot\xi}, \quad x\in\mathbb{R}^d,\ t\ge 0. \tag{7.3}$$

Let $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$, and consider the set

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{O}_{t,\varepsilon,\xi} :&= \big\{x\in\mathbb{R}^d : x\cdot\xi > tc^*_\xi + t\varepsilon|c^*_\xi|\big\} = \big\{x\in\mathbb{R}^d : e^{tc^*_\xi + t\varepsilon|c^*_\xi|} e^{-x\cdot\xi} < 1\big\}\\ &= \big\{x\in\mathbb{R}^d : e^{\beta^*_\xi t + t\varepsilon|\beta^*_\xi|} e^{-\mu^*_\xi x\cdot\xi} < 1\big\}.\end{aligned} \tag{7.4}$$

Note that, if, additionally, (7.1) holds, then $\mathscr{O}_{t,\varepsilon,\xi} = \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \widetilde{\Lambda}^+_\varepsilon(t, \widetilde{\omega}_{\mu^*_\xi})$, where the tilde above the set means that we have replaced β in (3.6) by $\beta^*_\xi > 0$.

Then, combining (7.3) and (7.4), we have

$$0 \le w(x,t) \le \|u_0\|_{*,\xi} e^{-\varepsilon|\beta^*_\xi|t}, \quad x\in\mathscr{O}_{t,\varepsilon,\xi},\ t\ge 0. \tag{7.5}$$

As a result, if the conditions above holds (i.e., in particular, both a and u_0 are light-tailed in the direction $\xi\in S^{d-1}$), then, by (1.20), the solution u to any equation of the form (1.1) with G which satisfies (A2) has at most linear speed of the propagation in the direction $\xi\in S^{d-1}$.

Suppose now, still for $m\in(0,\varkappa)$, that there exists $\mu_d > 0$, such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} a(x) e^{\mu_d|x|} dx < \infty, \tag{7.6}$$

then, in particular, there exist $\mu^*_\xi \in (0,\infty)$ for all $\xi\in S^{d-1}$. By the results of [28, Subsections 5.1, 5.2], the set

$$\Upsilon_t := \big\{x\in\mathbb{R}^d : x\cdot\xi \le tc^*_\xi,\ \xi\in S^{d-1}\big\} \tag{7.7}$$

is convex and bounded, and it has a non-empty interior. In particular, $\varkappa t\mathfrak{m}\in\Upsilon_t$, where

$$\mathfrak{m} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} x a(x) dx \in \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{7.8}$$

(Stress that those results were obtained using some properties of solutions to the equation (1.1) with $m\in(0,\varkappa)$ and G given by (1.9), however, they described the properties of sets which depend on a, $\varkappa$, m only.) Let Ξ be a finite subset from S^{d-1}. If, additionally, (7.2) holds for all $\xi\in\Xi$, then

$$0 \le w(x,t) \le \|u_0\|_* e^{-\beta^*\varepsilon t}, \quad x\in\mathscr{O}_{t,\varepsilon},\ t\ge 0, \tag{7.9}$$

where

$$\|u_0\|_* = \max\big\{\|u_0\|_{*,\xi} : \xi\in\Xi\big\}, \qquad \beta^* = \min\big\{|\beta^*_\xi| : \xi\in\Xi\big\},$$
$$\mathscr{O}_{t,\varepsilon} = \bigcup_{\xi\in\Xi} \mathscr{O}_{t,\varepsilon,\xi} \subset \mathbb{R}^d\setminus\Upsilon_t.$$

In particular, if $u_0 \in \mathcal{R}$, then one should assume that $\Xi = \{e_j, -e_j : 1 \le j \le d\}$, where $\{e_j : 1 \le j \le d\}$ is the basis of $\mathbb{R}^d$, whereas, for $u_0 \in \mathcal{M}$, the appropriate assumption will be to have that just $\Xi = \{e_j : 1 \le j \le d\}$. A generalization for the case when u_0 has double estimates by the functions from these classes, cf. (B4), is straightforward. Again, this result will cover all equations (1.1), provided (A2) holds.

Let now $m \le 0$. Then the solution to the equation (1.19) may be represented in the form $w(x,t) = e^{(M-m)t}v(x,t)$, where v solves the equation

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}v = \varkappa a * v - Mv$$

with $M \in (0, \varkappa)$ and $v(x,0) = u_0(x)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then under the same condition on a as the above, one gets the existence of the corresponding μ^*_ξ, β^*_ξ (which depend now on M instead of m), such that if the corresponding (7.2) holds, then

$$0 \le w(x,t) \le \|u_0\|_{*,\xi} e^{(M-m)t + \beta^*_\xi t - \mu^*_\xi x\cdot\xi}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d,\ t \ge 0.$$

Then replacing the set $\mathscr{O}_{t,\varepsilon,\xi}$ by

$$\widetilde{\mathscr{O}}_{t,\varepsilon,\xi} := \Big\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : x\cdot\xi > tc^*_\xi + \frac{M-m}{\mu^*_\xi}t + t\varepsilon|c^*_\xi|\Big\},$$

one gets the full analogue of (7.5), and, similarly, for (7.9).

Regarding a from below at infinity, note that, by (1.20), any such bound will hold for the solution $w(x,t)$ of the linear equation (1.19). In particular, one can consider the equation (1.1) with G given by (1.9), where $a^- = a$ and $\varkappa^- > 0$ is arbitrary. Again, we suppose first that $m \in (0, \varkappa)$. Then (1.14) holds; and also (4.1) holds, provided that a is separated from 0 in a neighborhood of the origin. Then, by [28, Proposition 5.19 and the proof of Theorem 5.10], there exists $\alpha, q, t_0 > 0$, such that

$$w(x,t) \ge q\exp\Big(-\frac{|x - t\mathfrak{m}|^2}{\alpha t}\Big), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d,\ t > t_0. \tag{7.10}$$

Note that, from the results in [28], taking $\varkappa^-$ arbitrary small and getting then θ in (1.11) arbitrary big, one can choose $q < \theta$ arbitrary close to θ and hence also arbitrary big, however, this will lead to bigger t_0. Note also that, in the contrast to (7.10), the upper estimates (7.3), (7.5), (7.9) were true for all $t \ge 0$. A modification for $m \le 0$ can be done similarly to the above. Certainly, the bound (7.10) is not optimal and, unfortunately, is not sharp w.r.t. to (7.3).

Bounds at infinity: the heavy-tailed case

Let $\omega \in \mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{M}$ be such that (5.15) holds, and let $0 \le \omega \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $\|u_0\|_\omega < \infty$. Denote $\|u_0\|_\infty := \|u_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)}$. Take arbitrary $\varepsilon, \delta \in (0,1)$ and choose $\tau_0 = \tau_0(\varepsilon,\delta) > 0$ such that, for $\lambda := e^{-\beta(1+\varepsilon)\tau_0}$,

$$(a * \omega)(x) \le (1+\delta)\omega(x), \quad x \in \Omega_\lambda = \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Lambda^+_\varepsilon(\tau_0, \omega).$$

Then, by (5.17), Proposition 5.1 and the proof of Proposition 5.2, we have that

$$0 \le w(x,t) \le D_\varepsilon \min\big\{e^{-\beta(1+\varepsilon)\tau_0}, \omega(x)\big\}e^{(\varkappa(1+\delta)-m)t}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d,\ t \ge 0,$$

where $D_\varepsilon := \|u_0\|_\infty e^{\beta(1+\varepsilon)\tau_0} + \|u_0\|_\omega$. Then, cf. Remark 5.5 and the proof of Theorem 5.4, if we take, in the above, $\delta = \frac{\varepsilon\beta\nu}{(1+\nu)\varkappa}$, where $\nu \in (0,1)$, one gets, for all $t > \tau_0(\varepsilon)$,

$$u(x,t) \le w(x,t) \le D_\varepsilon \omega(x) e^{\beta(1+\varepsilon)t} e^{-\frac{\varepsilon\beta}{1+\nu}t}, \qquad x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Lambda_\varepsilon^+(t,\omega). \tag{7.11}$$

Recall that the function ω, in the inequality (7.11), may be chosen as follows. In the assumptions of

– Proposition 6.1: $\omega(x) = b(x)^\alpha$, for any $\alpha \in (\alpha_0, 1)$.
– Proposition 6.2: $\omega(x) = b^\circ(x)$.
– Proposition 6.4: $\omega(x) = \int_{\Delta(x)} b(|y|)^\alpha dy$, for any $\alpha \in (\alpha_0, 1)$.
– Proposition 6.7: $\omega(x) = \int_{\Delta(x)} b^\circ(|y|) dy$.

To get lower estimates at infinity, recall that, by (4.23), for any $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ (we slightly change notations here) there exists $\tau_1 = \tau_1(\varepsilon) > 0$ and $\lambda_\varepsilon > 0$ such that, for all $t > \tau_1$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$w(x,t) \ge u(x,t) \ge \lambda_\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\Lambda_\varepsilon^-(t,c)}(x) + \lambda_\varepsilon c(x) e^{\beta(1-\varepsilon)t} \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Lambda_\varepsilon^-(t,c)}(x),$$

provided that $a * u_0 \ge c \in \mathcal{L} \cup \mathcal{N}$. In particular, cf. (7.11), for all $t > \tau_1(\varepsilon)$,

$$w(x,t) \ge u(x,t) \ge \lambda_\varepsilon c(x) e^{\beta(1-\varepsilon)t}, \qquad x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Lambda_\varepsilon^-(t,c). \tag{7.12}$$

In the assumptions of

– Proposition 6.1: $c(x) = Db_+(x)$ for some $D > 0$ (cf. Proposition 4.10).
– Proposition 6.2: $c(x) = b_\circ(x)$.
– Proposition 6.4: $c(x) = \xi \int_{\Delta(x)} b_+(|y|) dy$, cf. (6.4).
– Proposition 6.7: $c(x) = v_\circ(x)$.

Lower bounds inside expanded sets: linear equation

Let $0 \le u_0 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and suppose that a and u_0 are separated from 0 in a neighborhood of the origin and of an arbitrary point of $\mathbb{R}^d$, respectively. Suppose also that $a \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Take an arbitrary $L \ge \|u_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)}$.

Consider again the equation (1.1) with $m \in (0, \varkappa)$ and G given by (1.9) with $a^- = a$ and $0 < \varkappa^- < \frac{\varkappa - m}{L}$. Then, by (1.11),

$$0 \le u_0 \le L < \frac{\varkappa - m}{\varkappa^-} = \theta.$$

Next, let any of the following two possibilities is realized.

1) (7.6) holds; i.e. a is light-tailed. Suppose also that $\mathfrak{m} = 0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, cf. (7.8).

2) (4.2) and (4.20), with some $c \in \mathcal{L} \cup \mathcal{N}$, hold; i.e., roughly speaking, either a or u_0 is heavy-tailed.

Note that the possibilities are not alternative, in general.

Take an $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$. In both cases above, (1.15) holds, with $\mathscr{C}_t = \mathscr{C}_t(\varepsilon)$. Indeed, for the first case, by [28, Theorem 5.10, Corollary 5.11], we have (1.15) with $\mathscr{C}_t = \Upsilon_{(1-\varepsilon)t}$, cf. (7.7).

For the second case, we have explained in the Introduction, that the conditions (A2)–(A5) hold. Moreover, by (4.2), one gets from Proposition 4.1, that (A6) holds as well. Therefore, by Theorem 4.9, $\mathscr{C}_t = \Lambda_\varepsilon^-(t,c)$.

Take any $\delta \in (0, \theta - L)$. Since $u \leq \theta$, one gets from (1.15) , that there exists $T = T(\delta, \varepsilon) = T(L, \varepsilon) > 0$, such that, for all $t > T$,

$$\operatorname*{ess\,inf}_{x \in \mathscr{C}_t} u(x,t) > \theta - \delta > L.$$

Therefore, by (1.20), one gets that

$$\operatorname*{ess\,inf}_{x \in \mathscr{C}_t} w(x,t) > L, \quad t > T(L)$$

where, recall, w solves the linear equation (1.19), the level $L > \|u_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)}$ is arbitrary high, and the sets $\mathscr{C}_t$ expand to $\mathbb{R}^d$. A modification of this result for $m \leq 0$ is obvious.

Acknowledgements

Financial supports by the DFG through CRC 701, Research Group "Stochastic Dynamics: Mathematical Theory and Applications", and by the European Commission under the project STREVCOMS PIRSES-2013-612669 are gratefully acknowledged.

References

[1] M. Aguerrea, C. Gomez, and S. Trofimchuk. On uniqueness of semi-wavefronts. *Math. Ann.*, 354(1):73–109, 2012.

[2] M. Alfaro and J. Coville. Propagation phenomena in monostable integro-differential equations: acceleration or not? arXiv:1610.05908 [math.AP], 2016.

[3] F. Andreu-Vaillo, J. M. Mazón, J. D. Rossi, and J. J. Toledo-Melero. *Nonlocal diffusion problems*, volume 165 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI; Real Sociedad Matemática Española, Madrid, 2010. ISBN 978-0-8218-5230-9. xvi+256 pp.

[4] D. G. Aronson. The asymptotic speed of propagation of a simple epidemic. In *Nonlinear diffusion (NSF-CBMS Regional Conf. Nonlinear Diffusion Equations, Univ. Houston, Houston, Tex., 1976)*, pages 1–23. Res. Notes Math., No. 14. Pitman, London, 1977.

[5] D. G. Aronson and H. F. Weinberger. Multidimensional nonlinear diffusion arising in population genetics. *Adv. in Math.*, 30(1):33–76, 1978.

[6] H. Berestycki, J. Coville, and H.-H. Vo. Persistence criteria for populations with non-local dispersion. *J. Math. Biol.*, 72(7):1693–1745, 2016.

[7] B. Bolker and S. W. Pacala. Spatial moment equations for plant competitions: Understanding spatial strategies and the advantages of short dispersal. *American Naturalist*, 153:575–602, 1999.

[8] O. Bonnefon, J. Coville, J. Garnier, and L. Roques. Inside dynamics of solutions of integro-differential equations. *Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems - Series B*, 19(10):3057–3085, 2014.

[9] A. A. Borovkov and K. A. Borovkov. *Asymptotic analysis of random walks*, volume 118 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2008. ISBN 978-0-521-88117-3. xxx+625 pp. Heavy-tailed distributions, Translated from the Russian by O. B. Borovkova.

[10] C. Brändle, E. Chasseigne, and R. Ferreira. Unbounded solutions of the nonlocal heat equation. *Communications on Pure and Applied Analysis*, 10(6):1663–1686, 2011.

[11] X. Cabré and J.-M. Roquejoffre. The influence of fractional diffusion in Fisher-KPP equations. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 320(3):679–722, 2013.

[12] J. Chover, P. Ney, and S. Wainger. Functions of probability measures. *J. Analyse Math.*, 26:255–302, 1973.

[13] V. P. Čistjakov. A theorem on sums of independent positive random variables and its applications to branching random processes. *Teor. Verojatnost. i Primenen*, 9:710–718, 1964.

[14] D. B. H. Cline and S. I. Resnick. Multivariate subexponential distributions. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 42(1):49–72, 1992.

[15] J. Coville. Maximum principles, sliding techniques and applications to nonlocal equations. *Electron. J. Differential Equations*, pages No. 68, 23 pp. (electronic), 2007.

[16] J. Coville, J. Dávila, and S. Martínez. Nonlocal anisotropic dispersal with monostable nonlinearity. *J. Differential Equations*, 244(12):3080–3118, 2008.

[17] J. Coville, J. Dávila, and S. Martínez. Pulsating fronts for nonlocal dispersion and KPP nonlinearity. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 30 (2):179–223, 2013.

[18] J. Coville and L. Dupaigne. Propagation speed of travelling fronts in non local reaction-diffusion equations. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 60(5):797–819, 2005.

[19] J. Coville and L. Dupaigne. On a non-local equation arising in population dynamics. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A*, 137(4):727–755, 2007.

[20] U. Dieckmann and R. Law. Relaxation projections and the method of moments. In *The Geometry of Ecological Interactions*, pages 412–455. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2000.

[21] O. Diekmann. On a nonlinear integral equation arising in mathematical epidemiology. In *Differential equations and applications (Proc. Third Scheveningen Conf., Scheveningen, 1977)*, volume 31 of *North-Holland Math. Stud.*, pages 133–140. North-Holland, Amsterdam-New York, 1978.

[22] R. Durrett. Crabgrass, measles and gypsy moths: An introduction to modern probability. *Bulletin (New Series) of the American Mathematical Society*, 18(2):117–143, 1988.

[23] P. Embrechts, C. Klüppelberg, and T. Mikosch. *Modelling extremal events*, volume 33 of *Applications of Mathematics (New York)*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1997. ISBN 3-540-60931-8. xvi+645 pp. For insurance and finance.

[24] M. Essén. Banach algebra methods in renewal theory. *J. Analyse Math.*, 26:303–336, 1973.

[25] P. Felmer and M. Yangari. Fast propagation for fractional KPP equations with slowly decaying initial conditions. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 45(2):662–678, 2013.

[26] P. C. Fife. *Mathematical aspects of reacting and diffusing systems*, volume 28 of *Lecture Notes in Biomathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1979. ISBN 3-540-09117-3. iv+185 pp.

[27] D. Finkelshtein, Y. Kondratiev, Y. Kozitsky, and O. Kutoviy. The statistical dynamics of a spatial logistic model and the related kinetic equation. *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.*, 25(2):343–370, 2015.

[28] D. Finkelshtein, Y. Kondratiev, and P. Tkachov. Traveling waves and long-time behavior in a doubly nonlocal Fisher–KPP equation. arXiv:1508.02215.

[29] R. Fisher. The wave of advance of advantageous genes. *Ann. Eugenics*, 7: 335–369, 1937.

[30] S. Foss, D. Korshunov, and S. Zachary. *An introduction to heavy-tailed and subexponential distributions*. Springer Series in Operations Research and Financial Engineering. Springer, New York, second edition, 2013. ISBN 978-1-4614-7100-4; 978-1-4614-7101-1. xii+157 pp.

[31] N. Fournier and S. Méléard. A Microscopic Probabilistic Description of a Locally Regulated Population and Macroscopic Approximations. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 14(4):1880–1919, 2004.

[32] M. Freidlin. Wave front propagation for KPP-type equations. In *Surveys in applied mathematics, Vol. 2*, volume 2 of *Surveys Appl. Math.*, pages 1–62. Plenum, New York, 1995.

[33] J. Garnier. Accelerating solutions in integro-differential equations. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 43(4):1955–1974, 2011.

[34] O. Hallatschek and D. S. Fisher. Acceleration of evolutionary spread by long-range dispersal. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111 (46):E4911–E4919, 2014.

[35] F. Hamel, J. Garnier, and L. Roques. Transition fronts and stretching phenomena for a general class of reaction-dispersion equations. *Disc. Cont. Dyn. Syst*, to appear.

[36] F. Hamel and L. Roques. Fast propagation for KPP equations with slowly decaying initial conditions. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 249(7):1726–1745, Oct. 2010.

[37] C. Henderson. Propagation of solutions to the Fisher–KPP equation with slowly decaying initial data. *Nonlinearity*, 29(11):3215, 2016.

[38] V. Hutson, S. Martinez, K. Mischaikow, and G. T. Vickers. The evolution of dispersal. *J. Math. Biol.*, 47(6):483–517, 2003.

[39] A. N. Kolmogorov, I. G. Petrovsky, and N. S. Piskunov. Étude de l'équation de la diffusion avec croissance de la quantité de matière et son application à un problème biologique. *Bull. Univ. État Moscou Sér. Inter. A*, 1:1–26, 1937.

[40] Y. Kondratiev, S. Molchanov, A. Piatnitski, and E. Zhizhina. Resolvent bounds for jump generators and ground state asymptotics for nonlocal Schrödinger operators. arXiv:1606.03381.

[41] M. A. Lewis, S. V. Petrovskii, and J. R. Potts. *The mathematics behind biological invasions*, volume 44 of *Interdisciplinary Applied Mathematics*. Springer, [Cham], 2016. ISBN 978-3-319-32042-7; 978-3-319-32043-4. xvi+362 pp. With a foreword by James D. Murray.

[42] W.-T. Li, Y.-J. Sun, and Z.-C. Wang. Entire solutions in the Fisher-KPP equation with nonlocal dispersal. *Nonlinear Anal. Real World Appl.*, 11(4): 2302–2313, 2010.

[43] J. Medlock and M. Kot. Spreading disease: integro-differential equations old and new. *Mathematical Biosciences*, 184(2):201–222, Aug. 2003.

[44] S. Méléard and S. Mirrahimi. Singular limits for reaction-diffusion equations with fractional Laplacian and local or nonlocal nonlinearity. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 40(5):957–993, 2015.

[45] D. Mollison. Possible velocities for a simple epidemic. *Advances in Appl. Probability*, 4:233–257, 1972.

[46] D. Mollison. The rate of spatial propagation of simple epidemics. In *Proceedings of the Sixth Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability (Univ. California, Berkeley, Calif., 1970/1971), Vol. III: Probability theory*, pages 579–614. Univ. California Press, Berkeley, Calif., 1972.

[47] J. D. Murray. *Mathematical biology. II*, volume 18 of *Interdisciplinary Applied Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, third edition, 2003. ISBN 0-387-95228-4. xxvi+811 pp. Spatial models and biomedical applications.

[48] E. A. M. Omey. Subexponential distribution functions in $\mathbf{R}^d$. *J. Math. Sci. (N. Y.)*, 138(1):5434–5449, 2006.

[49] B. Perthame and P. E. Souganidis. Front propagation for a jump process model arising in spatial ecology. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 13(5):1235–1246, 2005.

[50] G. Samorodnitsky and J. Sun. Multivariate subexponential distributions and their applications. *Extremes*, 19(2):171–196, 2016.

[51] K. Schumacher. Travelling-front solutions for integro-differential equations. I. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 316:54–70, 1980.

[52] K. Schumacher. Travelling-front solutions for integro-differential equations. II. In *Biological growth and spread (Proc. Conf., Heidelberg, 1979)*, volume 38 of *Lecture Notes in Biomath.*, pages 296–309. Springer, Berlin-New York, 1980.

[53] N. Shigesada and K. Kawasaki. *Biological Invasions: Theory and Practice*. Oxford University Press, 1997.

[54] Y.-J. Sun, W.-T. Li, and Z.-C. Wang. Traveling waves for a nonlocal anisotropic dispersal equation with monostable nonlinearity. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 74(3):814–826, 2011.

[55] H. Weinberger. Long-Time Behavior of a Class of Biological Models. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 13(3):353–396, May 1982.

[56] H. Weinberger. On sufficient conditions for a linearly determinate spreading speed. *Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems - Series B*, 17(6):2267–2280, 2012.

[57] H. F. Weinberger. Asymptotic behavior of a model in population genetics. In *Nonlinear partial differential equations and applications (Proc. Special Sem., Indiana Univ., Bloomington, Ind., 1976–1977)*, pages 47–96. Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 648. Springer, Berlin, 1978.

[58] P. Weng and X.-Q. Zhao. Spreading speed and traveling waves for a multitype SIS epidemic model. *J. Differential Equations*, 229(1):270–296, 2006.

[59] H. Yagisita. Existence and nonexistence of traveling waves for a nonlocal monostable equation. *Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci.*, 45(4):925–953, 2009.

[60] G.-B. Zhang, W.-T. Li, and Z.-C. Wang. Spreading speeds and traveling waves for nonlocal dispersal equations with degenerate monostable nonlinearity. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 252(9):5096–5124, 2012.